UC-NRLF
B 2 792 207

KELEY
RARY
ERSITY OF
LIFORNIA
0 —D

This Book
was presented to the
Athenæum
by
Rev. A. Galton
on the 14. day of July 1899

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/messagepositiono00galtrich

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the same Author.

THE CHARACTER AND TIMES OF THOMAS CROMWELL. Cornish; Birmingham: 1887.

TWO ESSAYS ON MATTHEW ARNOLD, with some of his Letters to the Author. Elkin Mathews: 1897.

THE

MESSAGE AND POSITION

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BEING AN ENQUIRY INTO
THE CLAIMS OF THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH

WITH

An Appendix on the Validity of Roman Orders

BY

ARTHUR GALTON, B.A.

CURATE OF WINDERMERE

WITH A PREFACE ON THE ROYAL SUPREMACY
BY
J. HENRY SHORTHOUSE

AUTHOR OF 'JOHN INGLESANT' ETC.

1899

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. LTD.
PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD
1899

ATHENAEUM
CANCELLED.
LIBRARY.

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved)

3993A
BX5055
G181
1899
MAIN

TO THE

LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE

(WITHOUT HIS LEAVE)

IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF

GREAT KINDNESS

PREFACE

I AM inclined to think that the greatest service, among many great services, that Bishop Christopher Wordsworth rendered to the Church, is that part of his life and work which relates to the existence of National or State Churches, associated, as it was, with his labour with, and for, France and Italy. The known learning, and what appeared to some, perhaps, the exaggerated orthodoxy of the Bishop, disposes, at once, of the notion that there is anything in the idea of a National or State Church such as has always existed in the Church of England, allied to the heresy called Erastianism. The history of the Gallican Church, destroyed by Roman

Propagandism and intrigue, is of so pitiful a character as almost to destroy sleep, and what would have happened had Count Cavour not died, and a genuine National Church been established in Italy, according to his and the English Bishop's effort and desire, it is now, unfortunately, useless to inquire. I have no intention to enter upon a controversy as to the lawfulness of Kingly supremacy in the Church, my point is not what the Church of England ought to have held, but what it always has held. It was not without precedent and justification in history.

Whatever may be said about the conflict in the Jewish Polity between the Kingly and the Sacerdotal Power, the fact remains certain that the King was God's anointed, and that to David and to the Seed-Royal for ever, and not to any Priest or Prophet, was promised the Eternal Kingdom and the Rule of Righteousness. In the early days of the Kingdom of

Heaven upon Earth our Blessed Lord directed that the things belonging to Cæsar were to be rendered to Cæsar, and His Chief Apostle held that the Powers that be, Heathen though they were, were ordained of God, and did not himself disdain, on a purely ecclesiastical charge, to appeal to Cæsar. It was the 'counsel and deed' of Priests usurping the Civil Power, at the moment in feebler hands than those of Gallio, that crucified the Lord, it has been, often, the counsel of Priests that has crucified Him since.

Hooker says (book 8, p. 469, ed. 1666): 'no general Synod was ever called until the Empire became Christian, and Jerome, to disprove the authority of a Synod, uses these words as a forcible argument: *Dic quis Imperator hanc synodum jusserit convocari.*' The German Emperors exercised the right, in the time of Luther, to summon the contending parties before their judgment seat. The Germanic tribes saved the

world once, when, wandering after a legendary Asgard, they came across the Idea of Christ, and the German Protestant Princes saved the world again, when, at the head of their Lances, they protected Luther, and stayed the greed and tyranny of Rome.

What is the sense and what the fabric of the English Church? His Sacred Majesty, the anointed of God, the Lords temporal and spiritual, the King's Commons in Parliament assembled—that is, the entire Church. There is no antithesis here, of secular or spiritual; the entire State is the Church. That the Sacrament of Priesthood, which renders possible the administration of Sacraments, was delegated to an ordained class no more militated against this sovereignty of the entire Church, than did the fact that our Blessed Lord, when he came upon Earth, came not of the Tribe of Aaron, but of the Kingly Tribe of Judah, 'of which Tribe

Moses spake nothing concerning the Priesthood.'

I suppose that no one will dispute the assertion that Queen Elizabeth was the Head of the Church in her day. I cannot exaggerate my admiration of her work, her reign, her influence. She formed the Church of England, as it has existed since. James I. was the Head of his Church: Charles the First renounced his kingly birthright, and bowed too much to the power of the Bishops. He lost himself and destroyed the Church. Charles the Second was the Head of the Church in his day. He took a personal interest in it. He said that it was the religion of a gentleman. The Bishops of his appointment are among the best ever made, their writings are the salt of the Church to this day. During the whole of the last century, a century much maligned, the theory of State Christianity—the rule of the entire State—King, Lords and Commons, was exhibited to the full. The

dissenters of the Century to a large extent accepted it.

This unbroken system produced in England a race of Clergy such as no other system and no other country has ever produced; men who did not cease to be Laymen when ordained to the Sacrament of the Ministry; men who, while in perfect sympathy and accord with their fellow Laymen, were at the same time smitten through with a Divine Consecration and Pureness—a strain of love and hope—by the will and power of God and of Christ. Those of us who have attained to advanced life remember with emotion many such men, and 'our Fathers have told us' of more. It is difficult to avoid a sad foreboding, that the succeeding generations may be less happy.

My friend and distant cousin, Mr. Arthur Galton, with a very exaggerated estimate, as it seems to me, of the value of words of mine, has asked me to write

something in the fore-front of his volume. His exceptional experience of life and of religion, his studies and his knowledge; not only of books and languages and history, but also of human life; fit him for the task he has undertaken, and I gladly leave it in his hands. I commend his book to the serious attention of all thoughtful men, in view of this great battle of Armageddon, not only of this age, but of all time.

Viewed in the light of history, of the too obvious state of personal religion in Italy and France and Spain, that proud boast of Rome 'everywhere and by all people and through all time' would seem to be more truly expressed by 'believed nowhere, is believed by none, never was believed.' Springing from the worst traditions of decadent Pagan Rome, the Papal system never was a Church. It never was anything but a propagandist machine for extracting forced obedience and alms from an ignorant, a deceived, and a terrified

world. The Papal Curia is founded upon falsehood, and falsehood enters, consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, into the soul of every human creature that comes under its influence. It has poisoned the wells of religious life. Its story is one of horror, and of crime, and of cruelty. As I have said elsewhere, it always has been, and is now, the enemy of the Human Race.

J. HENRY SHORTHOUSE.

LANSDOWNE, EDGBASTON:
Saint Mark's Day, 1899.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
INTRODUCTION	xv
THE MESSAGE AND POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	1
ROMAN ORDERS: A SUGGESTION . . .	219
NOTES	233

INTRODUCTION

The Appendix on Roman Orders, added now to my Essay on the Church of England, expresses opinions which I have held for many years; and upon which I acted, in 1885, when I retired from the Ministry of the Roman Church. My opinions were cleared and strengthened by the Pope's Letter of 1896. As soon as I read it, I saw he had committed a grave error in tactics; and that he must in the end either retire from his position, or perish in it. To borrow a military phrase, the Pope's Letter enables us to take the offensive, with regard to the controversy on Orders, instead of acting as heretofore on

the defensive. The Appendix, as it is printed in this volume, was written for the Bishop of Carlisle, at the end of last year, when I found myself confronted by the awkward problem of being admitted to the Anglican Ministry on a Roman Ordination, in which I did not, and do not, believe. Personally, I cannot believe, at one and the same time, in the validity of Roman Orders, and in the assertions of Article XXVIII.; because those assertions appear, to me, to lead necessarily to the conclusions which I have drawn from them. I stated my difficulty, therefore, to the Bishop, and left the responsibility with him, submitting my own opinion without any scruple or hesitation to the present belief and practice of the English Church. In dealing with the question of Anglican and Roman Orders, I have used those arguments, and assumed those positions, which are common to the advocates on either side. My own views about Orders

are expressed more fully and accurately in my Essay, than in the Appendix. Saint Paul compares the Church to a body, of which, I suppose, ordained persons are the organs, or among the organs. Following out this analogy, I hold, that Orders depend on the Church; not the Church, on Orders. If this view were accepted and acted on, I believe it would do more than any thing else to heal the divisions and wounds of Christendom.

I am sorry I did not meet with Mr. Trevelyan's 'England in the Age of Wycliffe' until I had finished my own Essay. I shall not soon forget the delight, with which I read it, in the first days of freedom from my labours. His History would not only have been invaluable to me, but I should have liked to express my thanks and admiration in the body of my work, by making much use of his. He has given us the soundest and most interesting piece of English History, which

we have received for many years; and, unlike too many recent Histories, it is good, sound literature. It cannot be recommended too earnestly to those, who are interested or disturbed by the mediæval Church, and who wish to understand the causes of our Reformation. There are those, on the one hand, who can find no causes for the English Reformation, earlier than the first divorce of Henry VIII.; and there are others, who fail to distinguish between the Church of England and her various Calvinistic foes. As an active movement, our Reformation began in 1529, and lasted until 1662. Within a few years from the beginning, an Archbishop of Canterbury was murdered by the Papists. A few years before the end, another Archbishop was murdered by the Puritans. These two tragedies mark the middle and mediating position of the English Church, as well as the reality of her opposition to both extremes. If she

hold faithfully to that mediating and moderate position, rejecting both Sectarian and Sacerdotal innovations, the blood of those two martyrs of her Reformation may be the seed for the future re-union of Christendom.

My warmest thanks are due to Mr. Shorthouse, for his kindness in giving me a Preface. I could wish for no better introduction to my readers. There is not a truer nor a finer Church History than 'John Inglesant'; and any words of guidance by the author of 'John Inglesant' will be more than ever welcome to his admirers at the present time. His Preface and my Essay were not only written quite separately, but without any consultation between the writers at any stage or period of their work. Mr. Shorthouse, therefore, is not responsible for anything I have said. He will find little, I hope, with which he is not able to agree. If he can like my dissertation about our English Church, I shall

please an Anglican, whose good opinion I value more than any other, and one who has rendered a splendid service to the Church of England in this age of ours.

A. G.

CLEABARROW; WINDERMERE: *June* 20, 1899.

The Anniversary of Her Majesty's Accession.

THE MESSAGE AND POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I

All Christian men and women should be able to justify their creed. They should be able to explain, why they are Christians at all; and why they belong to one form of Christianity, rather than to another. Putting aside those, who are Christians only from habit, or by inheritance, all serious believers, I imagine, would say they are Christians, in the first place, and in the original meaning of the word, because they have been constrained or won

18

over to be followers of Christ, to accept him for their master and their model. They would go on to say, probably, that they had entered into this relationship because they accept the Bible, which had possessed them with the life and character of Jesus. Upon the Bible, then, all questions of historical and exterior evidence must ultimately rest. For our immediate purpose, the New Testament is that only portion of the Bible, which we need consider. Every one, who examines the New Testament, with a sufficient knowledge of its original language, and of the period with which it professes to deal, treating it as he would treat any other Grecian philosophy and history, must come to the conclusion, that a large part of it was written very near to those times and events, which it professes to describe; and that it was written by some of the actors, or eye witnesses, of that history, which it presents. In other words, the recorded history is genuine, and not mythical; for those dates,

which we must give to the several documents, allow no interval, between the events described and the recording of them, for the genesis of myths. This line of argument, for which most of the premisses are now accepted on all hands, excludes such hypotheses as those of Renan, or of 'Literature and Dogma,' as well as a great part of the reasoning in 'Supernatural Religion.' That is to say, arguments which are nothing, if they be not critically true, are beaten on their own ground; and are vitiated by their authors' misunderstanding of the questions in dispute, or by their misuse of their own weapons. When certain results are known, from other sources, to have followed from the history of the New Testament, and to be still of great influence in the world, having been continued through an unbroken succession of believers, the presumption becomes all the more strong, that the history of the New Testament is true. It is by some such argument, that

the truth of these Books may be established, apart from the witness to them of any organized Society, or Church. The documents can be accepted now on their own merits, as historical evidence, like all the other Greek and Roman classics; and this gives them an independent force, much greater than when they rested only upon tradition and authority. They bear witness to Christianity itself more decisively than any Church; but, merely as documents, they do not speak as decisively as we could wish about the controversies between one form of Christianity and another.

Some people meet this difficulty, which is the origin of all ecclesiastical disputes, by saying that no form, no organization, is required; that Christianity is nothing but a personal matter between each individual and God. To such reasoners, it may be answered, first, that this was not the view of the Founder of Christianity. In his discourses, especially in his parables, he speaks of a definite and a lasting Society

in which his teaching is to be continued, and by which it is to be spread. A great part of his life was devoted to the education of its first members. In the writings of these disciples, in the Acts and the Epistles, we find such a Society existing; and a great deal more is told us about it, than is usually remembered. It would be difficult to find an 'higher' or a more mystical affirmation of the Church and its prerogatives, than may be gathered out of Saint Paul. The standard of church organization recorded in the New Testament is quite sufficient to rebuke sacerdotal excesses, on the one hand, and to refute sectarian defects on the other. More than this, the opinion, that Christianity is nothing but an individual concern, is not borne out by the practice and belief of Christians, from the first ages onward. In such an essential matter, the opinion of the majority counts for something. Moreover, the whole teaching of history and experience is against such a view. If Christianity be

not organized, it is utterly vain and ineffectual. As the purpose of its Founder was to teach us the right service of man, as well as the right service of God, this is precisely what we should expect. The experience of history confirms the teaching of the New Testament. We must remember, at the same time, that the Founder of Christianity and his personal followers confined themselves to broad statements of principle. They seem to have left an almost boundless freedom of application and of detail.

These details have too often been raised into questions of principle; and have been used as a pretext for divisions. The unhappy question has, therefore, been forced upon many people, 'What form of Christianity shall I profess?' Or, 'If I belong already to one form, why should I remain in it, and not join another?' It may be said at once, that differences between Christians, when pushed to these extremes, are utterly wrong. They are

entirely against the mind and wishes of the Founder. They are by no means indifferent. We all have our responsibility with regard to them. Sooner or later, we may all have to face it. No amount of use or custom should make us indifferent to so shameful and sorrowful a crime against our Master, and our Brethren.

This question, about the form of Christianity, would not only be difficult for some people to answer; but their answer itself would be more difficult, for some of them, to justify. The question may be answered best, perhaps, if we consider briefly, not merely how the Bible has come down to us, but how Christianity itself has come down to us through the ages; and how it has been organized, or presented to mankind, in various times and places. If we can grasp that history, we shall have gone a long way towards understanding the original question, if not of solving it. I must, however, keep to the main lines or divisions of Christianity, and avoid all reference to side issues.

Our religion began in Jerusalem, as a Jewish sect; and spread by degrees over the towns of Syria. The chief agents in spreading it were those men, whom we call Apostles. Of these, we need only consider one, Saint Paul. He carried Christianity beyond the frontiers of Judæa, and preached it in the chief cities of the Empire: in Antioch, the metropolis of Syria; in Corinth and Thessalonica, the two capitals of Roman Greece; and finally in Rome herself, the mistress of the European world. All this was done within thirty-five years of the Crucifixion. After about three centuries of conflict with heathen Rome, Christianity emerged as the dominant religion of the Empire. It was then torn to pieces by internal quarrels, about its own philosophy. During the next hundred and fifty years, Christians were busy discussing the natures of Christ, and the nature of God. Their discussions were settled by Councils of the whole united Church, and were embodied in those two ancient Creeds,

which are still used by the Church of England, with one verbal change, and by the Orthodox Greek Churches without any change at all. At the period of the great Councils and the Creeds, the supreme ecclesiastical government of the Church was vested in four or five Patriarchs: of Jerusalem, of Antioch, of Rome, of Alexandria, of Constantinople. These Patriarchs were all equal in rank, and they had co-ordinate powers. Each of them was independent of all the others, in his own district. As Rome had been the cradle and capital of the whole Empire, the Patriarch of Rome naturally took precedence of the other Patriarchs; but he had no authority over any of them, nor over any of their people and affairs. The Patriarch of Constantinople, the modern capital, and the seat of government, was placed gradually and naturally after the Patriarch of Rome, and before the Patriarchs of older cities. He made some efforts, indeed, to gain precedence over the Patriarch of the ancient capital. The quar-

rels between these two Patriarchates led to the gravest and saddest consequences for the whole Church. All persons, clerical and secular, owned the Supreme Headship of the Roman Emperors, both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. The civil power was held, in the full Apostolic sense, to be 'ordained of God.' The terms 'ecclesiastical' and 'spiritual' had not then been confused, or merged, to the un-doing of the Church. Neither in the ecclesiastical nor the civil sphere was there any place for those claims, which were made afterwards, and are made still, by the Roman bishops. They were as foreign to the Patriarchal Church of the first ages, as they are to the Apostolic Churches of the New Testament. Dubious as the New Testament may be, as to many details of church polity, there can be no doubt whatever that it excludes the very notion of a Papacy; unless, indeed, as some think, the Papacy be aimed at in one dark passage of Saint Paul, and in some lurid chapters of the Revelation. With these

possible exceptions, the Church in heaven, as shown to us by Saint John, seems to have known as little of the Papacy as was known by the Apostolic Church on earth.

The next stage in church history was brought about by the decay of the Roman power in the West, through the invasion of the Barbarians; and by the Mahometan conquests in the East. By the latter, Eastern Christendom was almost blotted out. It persisted only in a diminishing area round Constantinople, under the Greek Emperors, until that place was taken by the Turks in 1453. It is too generally forgotten how much Europe and Christianity owe to the long, heroic struggle of the Byzantine Empire against the advance of tyranny. Since the fall of Constantinople, until the growth of Russia, the Orthodox Greek Church has existed only among small, scattered, semi-barbarous, and enslaved communities; and it has been vitiated necessarily by their misfortunes and defects: under the Russian Empire, it

has become once more the national religion of a vigorous and growing Power. It probably has a great and beneficent future in store for it. Sooner or later, it must be enthroned again at Constantinople; and, from that old seat of authority and learning, it may exercise a preponderating influence over the whole of Christendom. This Greek or Eastern Christianity was, to our irreparable loss, cut off entirely from Europe, at the beginning of the Middle Ages, at the critical moment when the modern nations were being formed. The ambition and ignorance of the Western Patriarchs were among the chief causes of that miserable schism. The Orthodox Greek Church has always used the writings, or theology, of the great preachers and teachers of the early centuries. It has always used the original language in which the New Testament was written, and the Apostles preached. Its ritual has remained unaltered for sixteen or seventeen hundred years. In spite of its corruptions, it is

an invaluable witness to the organization of Christianity, when it first entered into official relations with the State. It bears an equal witness against the four great errors, or dangers, of the Church: against Popish developments and aggressions; against sectarian innovations, and narrowness; against clerical ignorance, and popular superstition. Its virtues and its defects are thus equally useful to the historian of Christianity.

In the Western half of the old Roman Empire, the Barbarian Franks and Germans carried everything before them, during the fifth century. The Roman Emperor was deposed, and his place was taken by a Gothic Sovereign. Italy and all the Western provinces fell into disorder. The only representative of the old order, who was left, was the Roman bishop; and he soon began to undertake civil responsibilities, though always in dependence on the Emperor, or his nominal representatives. By degrees, Christianity won over the

Barbarians, as it had won the Romans. In many places; in Ireland, in Scotland, in at least half of England; it had never been destroyed. The Celtic Christians held fast to that Christianity, which had been brought to them at some immemorial time, in some unrecorded way; perhaps, by some of the personal followers of Christ, or even by the greatest of the Apostles. There are traditions and vague records, which may indicate a journey by Saint Paul into Spain, and perhaps even to the shores of Britain. The break up of the Celtic civilizations and commonwealths has been almost as great a loss to European Christianity, as the destruction and isolation of the Greeks. The tribal or clannish organization of the Celtic Churches would have been a perpetual corrective and protest against the aggressions of the mediæval and feudalizing Papacy. From the old Celtic sources, however, Christianity was spread again over Holland, and Scandinavia, and Switzerland, and Germany. Irish and

English missionaries were zealous and successful in these labours. The Romanized Celts of Gaul kept their religion, and soon managed to convert their conquerors. Our own Anglo-Saxon ancestors, in the South of England, were won over by missionaries from Gaul and Rome. The Scandinavians of the North-east, and the English of Mercia, were converted from Scotland. The West, or Wales and Cornwall, had always remained Christian. These three elements, or sources, of Christianity; the old British, or Welsh; the Irish, or Scotch; the French and Italian; were a long while settling down into one organized and united Church. It is going much too far, to say that England owes its Christianity to Rome. It is defying history and law, to say that the English Church is, or ever was, a dependency of Rome. The Patriarch of the West, who sent over a band of missionaries to Kent, in 597, where an opening had been prepared for them by French influences, would not

hear of the title 'Universal Bishop,' which was being aimed at by his brother of Constantinople. It is clear, from the strong language he used, that he would never have usurped it for himself, or for his successors. The Italian missionaries were, indeed, as such, envoys of the Latin Patriarch; but, as soon as Augustine had been made a bishop in Gaul, he and his suffragans became the heads of free and independent Churches, subject only to the prevailing laws of Christendom. Those laws, in the seventh century, knew nothing of Papal authority, as it was destined to grow in the Middle Ages. They knew still less of modern Papal attributes and claims. Even judged by the laws and customs of the seventh century, the Church of the English People was not subjected in any special way to the Western Patriarch, merely because some of their Sees were founded or restored by missionaries who had been sent from Rome. In our own days, many missionaries are sent out from England. As long as they are

pioneers, they depend on the mother country. As soon as they are successful and strong enough to be organized into dioceses, they gain all the rights and freedom of their position. So it was, too, thirteen centuries ago, when some of our ancestors were newly won to Christ. Ever since then, the Church of the English People has had an unbroken corporate existence. The See of Canterbury goes back more than two thirds of the way towards the beginnings of Christianity.

We have now traced the progress of Christianity from Jerusalem to Canterbury; through Greece and Rome; through the dim Celtic polities and peoples, who must not be forgotten. We may see from what sources, and through what organizations, it came to be established among the English People; who, to all these elements, added a large infusion of their own sobriety, stolidity, and sense. At the period we have reached, the once undivided Church of the whole Roman Empire, acknowledging

the Supreme Headship of the Emperor, who summoned and presided over its general Councils, making their decrees valid by his approval, had separated into two hostile branches. Their estrangement grew, as the controlling and uniting power of the Sovereign was weakened, and was finally abolished in the West. We must now, unfortunately, put aside the Greek Church from our consideration. As a Church, it had no influence on the formation of Western Christianity; though individual Greeks did good service, here and there. One of the most important of our own Archbishops was a Greek from Tarsus. The Greek language, the original New Testament, the great masters in theology, and above all the flexibility and fruitfulness of the Greek spirit, were banished out of Western Europe for more than a thousand years. All true knowledge of Christian antiquity was blurred. The remembrance of the old Patriarchal constitution of the Church was forgotten. The cruel and

crafty legal spirit of Pagan Rome was left face to face with the ignorance and ferocity of the Barbarian invaders. Out of these elements, mediæval Christianity was evolved. On these foundations, the mediæval Papacy was built. We may note in passing, that, in the only centuries when the whole Church was united, its ecclesiastical government may be described as a confederation of independent Patriarchates. The centre and bond of unity was the throne of Cæsar, who was the only Supreme Head on earth of a Church containing many nations, using many languages, and worshipping through many diverse liturgies.

When the last Western Emperor was removed, in 476, the Imperial Power was exercised nominally from Constantinople, through various legal or illegal representatives. Under Justinian, there was a glorious revival; and then the West entered literally upon the dark ages. They were ages of disorder, of ignorance, of violence, of utter misery. They cannot be painted too dark;

and, except for about twenty years, under the controlling hand of Charlemagne, they lasted at their worst until the rise of Otho the Great, or even till the civilization and conquests of the Normans in the eleventh century. In these dreadful times, our modern nations were moulded, and Latin Christianity was being organized. The memory of Rome, as a source of authority and law, was not wholly lost. Men turned to it in their weakness and despair. The bishops of Rome were soon immersed in temporal concerns, and soiled by the ambitions and cares of government; though they still only exercised such duties as representatives of the civil authority. That, which began as a duty, soon became a pleasure and a source of profit, then an object of ambition and intrigue, and at last a right. Much good, however, was done by those early bishops, especially by Gregory the First, the best and greatest of the whole succession. In him, the bishop was not forgotten in the magistrate. He was a

theologian, and not a diplomatist. His desire was not for temporal power, but for souls and missions. The modern world owes much to him. To no single body of men does it owe so much, as to his missioners, the Benedictines. They were the great civilizers and teachers of those dark ages. Through their good work, and also through the prevailing darkness, the Latin Patriarch, by causes which were not solely ecclesiastical, obtained a growing influence over the young nations of the West. It was that influence, which even a low civilization obtains over barbarians, the rudest law over an absence of any law, a Mother Church over her missionary conquests. In the centuries when Franks and Teutons were being slowly gained to order and religion, the Latin Patriarchs were laying the foundations of the Papacy. If all the Roman bishops had been like Gregory the First, their influence and position would not have been misused. He protested against the title of Universal Bishop. He

would have recoiled with horror from the claims of Gregory the Seventh, and still more from the attributes of Pius the Ninth. In the East, during these centuries, the victories of Islam were destroying the old Patriarchal con-federation of the Church. Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were lost to Christianity. Ephesus and all the flourishing Churches of Asia Minor were ruined. The Patriarch of Constantinople ministered to an ever decreasing area. The Greeks came to be regarded as hardly Christian. Through all these changes, the old constitution of the Church was forgotten in the West. The Germanic nations forgot, also, that the Latin Patriarch had once had his peers. If he had not been isolated, he never could have developed the mediæval Papacy. Besides this, during the eighth century, the Western Peoples were preparing to re-establish the Imperial polity and theory among themselves. They had come to believe, that in the rule and authority of Cæsar, they might find a bul-

wark against oppression and disorder. The Imperial theory did much to develop the Papacy, because it increased the importance of Rome herself, and of her bishops. At first, they were not the masters, they were hardly the equals, of Charlemagne, of Otho the Great, of the few vigorous mediæval Emperors. In time, all this was changed. The Popes of the eleventh century, led by Gregory the Seventh, challenged the Imperial Supremacy. Their mischievous assumptions date from the time when they began to look upon their temporal possessions as independent principalities, and upon themselves as the superiors of all other Sovereigns. Moreover, in the times preceding Charlemagne, the ecclesiastical powers of the Roman bishops were developed; and, to support them, the claims of Saint Peter began to be urged more tangibly and systematically. The ecclesiastical courtesies of those ages became the customs of the next; and these, in their turn, grew

into necessary laws, and then into prerogatives of the Holy See.

The spiritual power of the Roman bishops is based, ultimately, and solely, upon that text of Saint Matthew, which says, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.' It is difficult, indeed, to see, at first sight, what this text has to do with Popes. A Protestant might read it all his life, and never suspect the least connexion. A Romanist has the connexion so ingrained into his thought, that he cannot separate the words of the gospel from his own preconceived opinion. The connexion between Saint Peter and the Popes is worked out thus. There is a tradition, for which there is not much historical foundation, that Saint Peter was crucified in Rome, about the year sixty-eight. This tradition grew into the story, that he was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, and that he handed on the prerogatives, supposed to have been granted to him by this text, and by other passages in

the Gospels, to his successors in the bishoprick. For this part of the story, there is no historical foundation at all. It may be said at once, that the whole theory, so far as dates are concerned, breaks down hopelessly if we try to fit it in with the only reliable dates, which we have, in the Acts and the Epistles. Whether Saint Peter was ever in Rome, is a dubious question. There is not evidence enough to prove, or to dis-prove, it. The facts would seem to be against his being bishop. As to the text of Saint Matthew, not one of those early and great authorities, whom we call the Fathers, interpreted this text in the modern Papal sense; and they are the only reliable witnesses, whom we have, to the belief of their own times. Not only with regard to this text, but in treating the whole range of Scripture and theology, they are ignorant of the Roman claims, and of the prerogatives of Peter. The only one of them who seems to look in that direction

is Irenæus; and he can only be made a Papal advocate by mis-translating an important word; by rendering *convenire* as 'must be in concord with,' instead of 'must resort to.' This is not only the common meaning of *convenire*; but it is borne out, in this passage of Irenæus, by the context. What he says is, that 'to this Church, (the Roman) because of its more influential or stronger principality, (*i.e.* because of its dignity and influence as the Capital) every Church, that is to say, the faithful from all parts, must resort; and in it always, by those who come to it from all quarters, that tradition (or faith) which is from the Apostles, is preserved'; and, therefore, may be tested. In other words, the common universal faith, *quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, may be tested in Rome; because all the Churches corresponded with, or resorted to, the Capital. Rome was not to teach them, as in the Papal theory. They were to keep Rome from everything contradictory and strange. By

reversing this theory, the Papal doctrines have become what they are; and Rome, instead of being corrected by the Churches, has corrupted every Church in her communion. We may note in passing, that Leo XIII., in a recent encyclical about the Unity of the Church, mis-translates the critical word in Irenæus; and then stops short in the middle of the sentence, leaving out the explanation of Irenæus, that the faith of Rome is to be kept pure by the continual resort of the whole Christian world to its then capital. This omission is an infallible tribute to the proper sense of *convenire*, and to the real meaning of Irenæus; because, without that suppression, the mis-translation would stultify itself. Saint Augustine, indeed, confesses, that when he was young and heedless, he applied the term 'this rock,' in Matthew, to Saint Peter; but, afterwards, he came to the settled conviction, that the rock was Christ. Such an indirect testimony proves that the Papal

theory was quite unknown to Augustine, and to his age. The theory is contradicted, or rather excluded, by all that we know of church history and government during the early centuries. So convenient a way of settling controversies would not have been over-looked, had it been known, in the stormy period of the early Councils. It is difficult to believe, that the centre and key-stone of the whole Christian faith, according to the modern theory, should be omitted from the New Testament, and should even be excluded by so much of it. Scripture, the Fathers, church history, church organization, are all silent, and are all decisive against the whole Papal scheme, as well as against the Papal interpretation of this text. To all these witnesses, we may add the independent witness of language and of grammar.

But what, then, it may be fairly urged, is its meaning? Has it any definite meaning, or no meaning at all? People often say, in despair, if it does not mean that

Peter is the foundation of the Church, what else can it mean? The Fathers, our only authority for the first ages, give many interpretations. Some, with Augustine, hold that the 'rock' is Christ. Others, with better reason, as I think, understand the 'rock' to be Christ's divinity, which Saint Peter had been the first to own. More important, perhaps, for us, in these days, when we want to settle the meaning of any passage, is an appeal to the individual words, taken in their philological sense, and as used by writers of authority. To this meaning, we should add the sense of the words, taken in their context and sentences, according to the strict rules of grammar; and the sentences must be read as a lawyer would read them, excluding every preconceived opinion, not going outside the words, and reading nothing into them. The words in question run thus in Greek *Σὺ εἶ πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.* The test words are *πέτρος* and *πέτρᾳ*. *Πέτρα* means a

large and living rock, a great mass: πέτρος means a small fragment of rock; a fragment, it may be, detached from the larger mass. Πέτρᾳ and not πέτρος is obviously the leading word. To proceed farther, the pronoun ταύτῃ might conceivably be reflexive in its meaning. It must, in any case, refer to the 'nearer' of two words; besides, the grammatical necessity, in this case, obliges us to confine it to πέτρᾳ. The whole force of ταύτῃ, then, falls on πέτρᾳ. If we translate the Greek words literally, we may get in English, 'Thou art a fragment of rock; and on this large [or living] rock, I will build my Church': or, paraphrasing a little, we might say 'Thou art a piece of the rock; and on this living rock, I will build my Church.' Speaking colloquially, the force of ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ might even be rendered as 'on this here rock.' Πέτρᾳ cannot be made subordinate to πέτρος, without violating the Greek. The pronoun shows that πέτρᾳ must be referred to the person speaking, not to the

person spoken of, or spoken to. Even the Latin *hanc petram*, not *illam* or *istam*, forces us to the same conclusion. The πέτρα, or living rock, must be Christ, the person speaking; and, from the context, we may presume, that the term 'rock' signifies here Christ's divinity, which must, indeed, be the sole foundation of the Church and its only barrier against the evil powers. The word πέτρος, in Greek, is a common noun; and our Lord applied it to his disciple Simon. As a proper name, it carried its common meaning, and fixed that meaning on Simon Peter. The general application of the name is brought out by Peter's history, and by the development of his character. The particular application, in this passage, may be referred to his confession of our Lord's divinity. The plain accurate meaning of the Greek words bears out thoroughly the best interpretation of the Greek Fathers. If Greek had not been lost to the Westerns, before the Papal interpretation became current, that interpreta-

tion could never have been read into this very simple passage. As the Papal meaning was unknown to the Fathers, it is, and always has been, repudiated by the whole Greek Church. It could only have been foisted, in the darkest ages, upon the unlearned Westerns, who did not even know their Latin accurately. We must remember, that, as, in Greek, πέτρος is a common as well as a proper noun, the meaning of the proper name was always clear. The due relation between πέτρα and πέτρος could not be obscured, even when πέτρος was personified. In Latin, this distinction is lost at once; because there is no common noun *Petrus*. There is only the proper name. The Latins, therefore, in their ignorance of Greek, were not able to see the due proportion between *Petrus* and *petram*. All their attention was directed to the subordinate word *Petrus*, instead of to the leading word *petram*. They read the words, indeed, as they are given by Saint Jerome: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo*

ecclesiam meam; but they understood them, as though they were: *Tu es Petrus, et super te Petrum aedificabo ecclesiam meam.* Nothing short of this manipulation of the words will force the Petrine meaning into them. Saint Matthew must be edited in this way, if the Petrine application is to hold good, even in the Latin. 'Thou art Peter, and on thee, Peter, I will build my Church': this is what the Papal rendering comes to; but it cannot be accepted as a fair translation of the Latin, and still less of the Greek original. The full Papal meaning requires a larger effort; because, though we force the Petrine application into the words of the text, we are as far as ever from hearing anything about the successors of Peter.

Indeed, taking the Greek words simply as they stand, construing them grammatically, reading them with no bias, nor with any preconceived opinion, reading nothing into them, the natural conclusion would be, surely, that, if Peter is to have, strictly

speaking, any successors, then every man, who follows Peter, by making that same confession, which Peter made, of Christ's divinity; and founds his life upon it, according to the Lord's conditions of membership in his Church; is a successor of Peter, and is a fragment of the rock. To every such man, too, our Lord has given the keys of the kingdom; so far as his place in that kingdom depends on his own ruling of himself, and his use of the divine privileges. To narrow the application of the text, and to confine it arbitrarily to a succession of bishops, and to exalt them, solely on the supposed meaning of these words, is in truth a violent handling of documents, for which the only justification would be the most unmistakable warrant from the beginning, certified by some exterior evidence. We not only have no such warrant or witness, but all the evidence looks the other way. The whole Papal construction and exegesis of this text is only to be equalled by some of the wild stories

in the 'Gesta Romanorum.' It is based on a tradition, which is as un-historical as the donation of Constantine, or the stories of the Three Kings and the Seven Champions. It has no more weight in theology, than any other wild mediæval legend has in sober history. It is, however, the sole foundation of the Papal system. All the arguments for and against the Popes' authority, and other Roman developments, come back at last to this one text, which was mis-understood by the mediæval theologians, and has to be mis-translated or manipulated by the Ultramontanes. In English, the text is meaningless, or mis-leading. In French, it is nothing but a trap for the unwary. In Latin, it is little more than a jingle of words, to which the clue was lost in the middle ages. The only clue to it is the Greek, in which alone the due relation between πέτρα and πέτρος can be distinguished. The history of this text is the earliest, as it is the most flagrant illustration of what happened to the

Western Church when all knowledge of the Greek language and of Christian literature had been withdrawn. Renan speaks somewhere of 'la divine ironie de Jésus.' With all reverence, I can accept the phrase; as the truth of it is borne in upon me whenever I read some of the discourses to the Pharisees. That irony alone would make me disbelieve the Pope, when he asserts, as he does by manipulating this text in Latin, that the Church is founded on a bad pun. That is, really, what is proclaimed to the world from Saint Peter's dome. The Greeks were preserved from this enormity by their real knowledge of the words, which do not lend themselves in the original to any such mis-use. The Papal Church is, indeed, founded on a mis-use of Scripture. The Church of Christ must have a more sure foundation. If it be not founded on his divinity, and on nothing less, it could not have survived the dark ages, and the ages of Papal tyranny;

nor would it have any valid claim upon our allegiance.

The Temporal Power of the Pope, and his invasions of the Imperial Supremacy, are based upon another fiction, which could only have been made current in a time of gross ignorance and credulity. By the 'Donation of Constantine,' as the legend runs, that Emperor, when he was baptized in Rome, left his Capital to the Popes, and founded another at Constantinople. He also granted various territories to the Popes, including 'all the islands of the sea.' Constantine did, of course, found a new Capital; but he was only baptized on his death-bed, and not in Rome. The strangest part of this legend is, that, apparently, the Popes knew nothing of it until the days of Pepin. This fiction, however, enforced by innumerable wars, by a great deal of most un-Christian diplomacy, and fortified by some legacies, which were probably all void in feudal law, is the sole foundation

for the Temporal Power, and the Sovereignty of the Papal States. We must remember, that many bishops, in the middle ages, were Princes, with palatine authority and jurisdiction; as, for instance, the Prince Bishops along the Rhine; but all of them acknowledged a feudal superior. The bishop of Rome was enabled, through the Papal fictions, to rebel against his Sovereign the Emperor, to annex parts of his territory, and finally to usurp the Imperial Supremacy itself. Fortified by this new temporal position, and still manipulating his Papal claims, he went on to annex the old prerogatives of other bishops, and to invade the freedom of all the national Churches, in what had once been the Latin Patriarchate. Although the Patriarch no longer had any peers, to check his innovations, there was some remembrance of earlier freedom, and of ancient law, among the various national Churches, rude and ignorant as they had become. To bear down this opposition, other fictions were devised; and a series of

gross forgeries, though manufactured for a very different purpose, was adopted and used for the advantage of the Popes. Archives, also, were discovered in Rome, as they were needed, asserting the Papal authority, against all the former laws and customs of the Church. Canons and Acts of early Councils were forged for the same purpose, and in the same clumsy way. Letters of early Popes were manufactured, to bear out these fictitious laws and canons. Passages of the Fathers were invented, and interpolated into their text. In other cases, by manipulation, or by still bolder omissions, passages, which were really dead against the Papal claims and innovations, were made to witness in their favour. These various documents, which were known finally as the 'Forged Decretals,' began to be circulated about the middle of the ninth century. They had become authoritative before the middle of the tenth. An hundred years later, they were introduced into the Canon Law, and were accepted as

the fundamental constitution of the Western Church. Thomas Aquinas, in honest ignorance, though with some suspicion about details, admitted them into his theology. These forgeries were so clumsy, that, when learning revived, their origin was betrayed: they defeated their own purpose, and are a clear witness to the aggressions by Rome upon the old rights and freedom of the national churches. The only apology for them is, that, if the Papal claims had not some real foundation, these forgeries could never have been made current. This apology does not really meet the facts. Every one of the Papal claims appears to have been resisted at some time, or in some place. The whole body of them is contrary to the old canons of the Church. But the conservative churchmen were never united against the innovator. The civil and ecclesiastical authorities never made a common league against the usurper. The lower clergy were made use of to curtail the ancient

powers of the bishop. Bishops' grievances or appeals were used to humble the metropolitans. The Regular Clergy were made use of to weaken the bishops, and to damage the old parochial and diocesan machinery. Kings and churchmen were played one against the other, to the lowering of both. Nations and Sovereigns were set by the ears, for the advantage of the Papacy. In all this, there was of course some deliberate mis-doing; but it was, on the whole, only the natural development of a centralizing Power. The error is in supposing it was based on supernatural or divine authority. Putting the forgeries on one side, the Papacy developed at the expense of the national Churches, just as the Parisian monarchy developed at the expense of the local Parliaments in France, and of all the other old authorities in that kingdom. It is true, no doubt, that the bishop of Rome would have enlarged his authority, to some extent, without the help of the False Decretals.

It is equally true, I think, that the career of Gregory VII., and the Papacy of Innocent III., were only made possible by these outrageous frauds. It was the system of those Popes, and the theology evolved from it, which enabled their successors to put off the Reformation until the Church was forced into a revolution. And, worse than all, the Jesuit theologians of the counter-Reformation accepted these forgeries, knowing them to be false, as the basis of the Tridentine Papacy. The great mediæval theologians had, at any rate, so far as we can tell, accepted most of them in ignorance and good faith.

Their good faith, however, did not save their ignorance from serious blunders in theology. Doctrine was corrupted, as well as discipline, in the middle ages. In the ninth century, there began to be disputes about the nature of the Eucharist, and the prevailing opinion became more and more material. The early Church believed the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

His presence was all the more real, because it was held to be spiritual, not carnal and material. The belief of the early Church rested on the words of institution, on the words of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, and on the discourses of Christ given in the sixth chapter of Saint John. The primitive belief is held still in all the Eastern Churches, and it is laid down by the English formularies. The Roman authorities of the thirteenth century, being equally ignorant of Greek, of Christian antiquity, of natural science, and of metaphysics, took upon themselves to explain, or define, the mode of Christ's presence in the Sacrament. Their definition is known as Trans-substantiation. It formulates a carnal and material view of the Sacrament, which seems to be incompatible with primitive belief. The Anglican article obliges us to hold, that it 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.' It also tells us, that it 'cannot be proved by holy writ,' and 'is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.' More than this,

it 'hath given occasion to many superstitions.' This doctrine, long before it was defined by the Lateran Council, had led to an increase of what we should now describe as clericalism. It was connected with those notions, which caused the great battle for clerical celibacy; and led to those vast pretensions, adopted and fostered by Gregory VII., which made the clergy into a caste altogether separate from the laity, and were the pretexts for abominable wars between the ecclesiastical and civil Powers. It may be said, on the whole, that this doctrine lay at the root of all those corruptions, abuses, and usurpations which finally brought on the Reformation. Nor did its evil effects end there. Opposition to it, or to popular abuses of it, drove some of the Reformers into denying every kind of real presence, spiritual as well as carnal. Trans-substantiation and the real presence are by no means the same. To deny Trans-substantiation need not imply any denial of the real presence, as the

Romanists assert: nor does the disproof of Trans-substantiation establish that real absence, which other controversialists seem to long for. Such advocates seem to be ignorant of what Luther, and even Calvin, said about the Eucharist.

We may now sum up shortly a few Roman developments, which were made possible only through the ignorance of the middle ages; by that rudeness and disorder which prevailed in the whole West, except among the happy Arabians of Spain, when the Papacy came into being. In 680, in spite of the warnings of Gregory the Great and Good, Pope Agatho usurped the title of 'Universal Patriarch.' In 752, Pope Zachary began to send out Legates. In 840, the False Decretals were published. Twenty years later, they were used by Nicholas I. to lessen the power of Archbishops. In 1050, celibacy was imposed upon all persons in holy Orders. In the same year, Interdicts began: a new encroachment on the laity. In 1061, Alexander II. claimed the

right of confirming the appointment of all bishops: that is, he claimed a veto on all elections. In 1066, monasteries were exempted from episcopal visitation and control. In 1059, the election of Popes, which had been the right of the whole Roman People, was usurped by the Cardinals; and in 1100, the laity were excluded from electing any bishop. In 1073, Gregory VII. began to reign. He had long ruled; and his public life was an unceasing battle with the civil Power. His pretext was the investiture of the clergy with the temporalities of their office. In reality, he was fighting for the supreme Power, as against the Emperor, and for the Sovereignty of the Papal States. In 1076, he ventured to depose the Emperor. It was he, who made the clergy into a sacred caste; and who said that the 'secular power was from the Devil': thus differing from Saint Paul, who said it was 'of God.' In effect, he turned what had been the old Latin Patriarchate into a rigid feudal organiza-

tion, of which the Pope was not only the ecclesiastical head, but was to be the temporal lord, so far as church property and clerical persons were concerned. The result of all this was, that lay tribunals were forbidden at last to deal with clergymen. In 1200, Innocent III. went on to attack the Sovereigns of Europe, by asserting that several of them were his vassals in reality, and all of them in theory. In his age, Crusades were ordered against Christian people; and the Inquisition was established. As the exemption of monasteries had broken into the old rights and discipline of bishoprics, so the institution of the Friars, amenable only to the Pope, and with their Generals resident in Rome, broke into the old parochial organization, to the grievous damage of the people, of the clergy, and eventually of morals. The Popes claimed, finally, to over-ride all clerical elections, and all rights of patronage; to tax at their will the clergy and church property of all nations, and to

summon all business, that was important or profitable, to Rome. To the Church itself, the theologians attributed the most outrageous prerogatives and powers. It was literally, in their treatises, 'full of names of blasphemy.' All these attributes and powers were given to, or came from, the Pope, who was the Church personified. His was, indeed, 'a mouth speaking great things.' He was the sole dispenser of salvation, and the source of law: In his breast, were the oracles of God. Without his approval, the Scriptures themselves were of no authority, and all the commandments of God were void. This is what the mediæval Papacy had come to, when it culminated under Boniface VIII., at the Jubilee of 1300. It rested upon nothing more solid than a mis-reading or manipulation of the eighteenth verse of the sixteenth chapter of Saint Matthew. The mis-reading was only possible because all true knowledge and use of Greek had been lost The vast structure built on that mis-

reading was only possible because the Greek Fathers and theology had been forgotten, and the old organization of the Church had been obliterated, in memory as well as fact. This Papal system was produced by the cruel and crafty spirit of Pagan Rome, taking advantage of disorder, professing Christian formulæ, and deluding the ignorance of our barbarian fathers.

Rome herself, the supposed centre of light and order, was a scene of ignorance and crime, almost incredible. For nine hundred years, a great historian tells us, 'not a single work of any importance' was composed there; that is, from the time of Gregory the Great, onwards. Twenty-four Papal wars may be enumerated in the middle ages; and the Papacy was bought oftener than it was battled for. The old severity of penance was commuted into money payments; and, by the ninth century, the whole system of religion had assumed a financial character. The Roman clergy expected a payment for every

service, and an elaborate system of perquisites and fees grew up. The laity were forbidden to speak on matters of faith, even in private, and among their families; and inquisitorial delators were as busy as they used to be under the worst Emperors. The old common church property was annexed by the clergy, and distributed into benefices. The rights of the laity were ignored, and the clergy monopolised all. Side by side with these clerical abuses were the wars and violences of the great Roman families. The Popes themselves were, too many of them, such men as John XII., and his bewildering family; who, in the tenth century, anticipated their greater successors of the Renaissance. From Gregory the First in 590 to Sylvester the Second in 999, few indeed of the Popes were both good and famous. Of such Popes as Gregory VII., and Innocent III., we must own, with Gibbon, that their virtues, rather than their vices, were dangerous to mankind.

The histories of Germany, of North Italy, and of France, with all their crusades, interdicts, and breaches of civil order, are almost more wretched than the history of Rome herself. The clerical immunities led to the worst results. Monastic discipline became more and more relaxed. The higher clergy gave themselves almost wholly to political affairs, as some of the Religious Orders did to business. Almost every law could be dispensed from, at a fixed rate. Divorce, though not allowed in theory, was easy and was frequent. With licences for clerical concubinage, it produced a comfortable revenue. Worse than all, the assumption of the Popes, to dispense from oaths and treaties, relaxed the foundations of political morality and public faith. This was not a form of arbitration, of release from obsolete or impossible conditions. It was the relieving of one party to an agreement, without the consent or knowledge of the other.

The mediæval Papacy fell to ruin with

Boniface VIII. For some years, a succession of nominal Popes was a tool in the hands of the French monarchy. Then there followed a period of disorder when two, and at last three, claimants professed at once to be true bishops of Rome. The councils of Basle and Constance vindicated the old and constitutional supremacy of the assembled Church; but they tried in vain to deal with the question of reform. In this, Rome always blocked the way. When the Popes were restored to their own bishopric, they soon forgot they were bishops, and devoted all their resources to enlarging the Papal States by diplomacy and conquest, or to diminishing them for the establishment of their sons and nephews. By the end of the fifteenth century, the Popes were regarded as little more than Italian princes, struggling with their rivals, in that unhappy country, for territories and influence: but, as an advantage in the struggle, drawing enormous revenues from ecclesiastical property all over Europe, and

from their legal machinery in Rome. Their old spiritual weapons were little thought of, anywhere. In Italy, they were of no account at all. The successors of Peter had not only snatched the forbidden sword, but the purse of Judas. The sword and purse, and not the mysterious keys, had become the real supporters of the triple crown. And so we come to the century of the Reformation.

We have now surveyed the thousand and odd years of Popery, from the break up of the old united Church and Empire, to the beginning of the sixteenth century. We may see, first, the damage caused to Europe by the loss of the Greek language, and the Greek Church. We may see, next, the damage caused both to States and Churches by the abolition of the old Supreme Head, the Emperor; and the usurpation of his office and authority by an ecclesiastical Power. That this ecclesiastical Power was more 'spiritual' and Christian than the civil power 'ordained

of God,' I fail to see. Such a notion seems to me incompatible with the Christianity of the Apostles, as recorded by the whole New Testament; and the logical conclusion of its principle is nothing less than the dictum of Hildebrand, that 'the civil power is of the devil.' That doctrine, sometimes expressed, and always understood, gives us a clue to the history of the mediæval Church. Most of its miseries and wars were caused by men who tried to enforce that doctrine: most of its corruptions were caused because it was enforced successfully. Except in a few flagrant instances, I refrain altogether from imputing bad motives to the agents in this clerical usurpation. Deliberate frauds, no doubt, were committed at Rome, by some of the Popes, or by their officials. Innocent III., and even Gregory VII., were not bad men. They were grievously mistaken, and are examples of high gifts and powers misapplied. But, while not thinking harshly of their characters and

motives, I feel constrained to hold, with Gibbon, that they, and not such Popes as John XII. and XXIII., or as Alexander VI. and the more abominable Sixtus IV., were the most dangerous enemies of mankind. If the principles of mediæval catholicism had been sound, such Popes as Alexander would be no more an argument against it, than bad Kings and corrupt Parliaments would be an argument against our Constitution. As that catholicism is unsound, this line of argument is inapplicable. The 'genius' of Rome herself, if we may so describe it, was bad. It was cruel, crafty, Pagan, legal, not really Christian at all; and these qualities were leavened by that still more anti-Christian element, which we may describe too loosely, but understand very well, as 'Clericalism.' It was this, which took advantage of the prevailing ignorance, 'to deceive the nations'; and we cannot separate mediæval catholicism from its evil and inspiring 'genius.' On the one

hand, it set up a tyranny, as against the laity and the civil Power: on the other hand, fortunately, it fell a victim to its own avarice: it set up everything to sale; and so damaged its credit, and the value of its commodities. By these proceedings, however, it caused irreparable damage to religion, as well as to private and political morality. The truth and justice of the Latin races still suffer from that long corruption. To form an equitable notion about the mediæval Church is neither an easy nor a simple matter. We have been presented with too many extreme notions, from both sides. It would be difficult to say which extreme has done more harm. A fair notion can only be gained by a vast number of independent and scattered facts, gathered from many sources, some direct, some indirect, varying much in kind and value, but all converging in the same direction, and all uniting at last into a great and solid mass of evidence, which must be accepted, if we are to accept

anything in history. Sift it, minimise it, make every allowance for error and exaggeration, every allowance for prejudice or half-knowledge in our own times, and for credulity or malice in the past, enough remains to form a case, which cannot be substantially altered by ourselves. That was the case with which the Reformers had to deal. It formed then, and it forms now, a terrible indictment against the Roman Church, against its origin, its development, its institutions, its principles, and its effects. These broad and fair conclusions of history may not be acceptable to modern Romanists, or to their sympathizers; but, if they be not accepted, then the best theologians of the fifteenth century, and the ecclesiastical authorities of the sixteenth, by their actions, by their own language about the nature and necessity of a reform in discipline, were themselves the authors of a deliberate and monstrous libel against the whole body of the clergy, and especially against the

Court of Rome. I leave their successors and apologists to take whichever alternative they choose.

But, putting morality and church government on one side, the most serious charge against the whole mediæval Church, so far as we in this nineteenth century are concerned, may be brought to a much simpler test, and one not open to dispute. The mediæval Church did not know either Testament in the original. It knew nothing of the times and circumstances in which either Testament came into being, or to which it referred. It was equally ignorant of the letter and the spirit. It knew just as little of the sub-apostolic age, and of Christian antiquity. Its only knowledge of the Fathers was through translations; and they, to a large extent, were spurious or tampered with. It only knew some of the chief Acts and Canons of the more important Councils in mis-translations, or through forgeries. It had forgotten many of the laws and the whole

organization of the ancient, united Church; and it outraged most of those laws, which it had not forgotten. Its own system was built up on forgery, and tyranny, and fraud; and it culminated, quite logically from such premisses, in the Papacy of Boniface VIII., with all his monstrous claims and attributes. Would any man, or any body of men, with such credentials, be accepted as of the least authority, in this age of ours, for any science, or any branch of learning? Yet this is, precisely, the case of the mediæval Church. It is out of court, as an authority, solely on the plea of ignorance.

This ignorance was not the fault of individuals; nor, altogether, of institutions: it was a misfortune inherent in those conditions, through which the mediæval Western Church and nations were passing, after the break up of the Empire, and their separation from the East. Not only were the language, literature, and polity of the Greek Churches lost, but the freshness,

freedom and flexibility of the Greek spirit were lost as well. This loss was almost equally fatal, both to the mediæval Papacy, and to those Reformers, who left Rome in the sixteenth century, without having felt the Greek revival. Western Europe, composed of young and barbarous Peoples, was shut up within itself, for nearly a thousand years, with only a debased form of Latin, and a few scattered shreds of knowledge, as its only inheritance from the great past. Naturally, in this ignorant isolation, its point of view was narrowed and distorted. All sense of proportion and connexion was destroyed. Every true standard of judgment and comparison was removed. Those ages could only look at the past through themselves, and their own experiences. They applied this curious and wrong perspective to every species of knowledge: to their theology, no less than to their science and their history. Hence that strange mingling of Christianity and the classics, which we find in Dante; and still more,

in some of Dante's predecessors, who combined with it the wilder mythology of Scandinavians and Celts. It was through this wrong perspective, that Virgil came to be held for a magician; and that no difference was perceived between history and legend. It was the same in all the arts; and we can still realize it in early paintings. Most outrageous of all was it in philology, and most fatal in its results. The heroes of Greece and Rome, the characters of the Old and New Testaments, wore the clothes and spoke the language of the middle ages. They were made to use mediæval terms; and mediæval meanings were attached to their genuine words and thoughts. History, philosophy, theology, the Holy Scriptures themselves, all wore a mediæval dress, and were regarded from the mediæval point of view. The earth and the whole material universe were limited in the same way. The mediæval point of view is full of interest, and is perpetually charming; but, we must allow for it, when

we pass on to serious criticism. We must not let it bias or dominate our own knowledge of the past. We all have allowed for it, and escaped from it, in classical history and literature. We have by no means all escaped from it in theology, or in church government. Nor shall we escape, until we realize that the Papal claims, the donation of Constantine, and all that depends on them, are precisely on the same level, and of as much or as little value, as any other mediæval interpretations of history and the classics.

It is to this bounded mediæval view, however, that some of us, even in these days, venture to appeal against the formularies and laws of our own Church. Such reasoners set up the childish, and immoral, and bounded mediæval Church as the measure, or the sole standard, of their Catholicity: whereas, it is, in truth, a barrier, still interposed, in spite of the Reformation, between ourselves and the true Church. As a true knowledge of antiquity has been

recovered from its writings and remains, so a knowledge of the true Christianity is to be recovered; and in the same way, by leaving spurious documents, legends, practices, and institutions, and going straight to genuine writings and remains. Until the true nature and development of the mediæval Church and theology be understood, we shall never cease to be disturbed by those who are frightened or deceived through its fictitious and phantom claims. The mediæval Church had not, in truth, the least authority to speak on any of those subjects, which it decided with so much arrogance and certainty. Its claim to speak through the Pope is only founded on a mis-reading of Saint Matthew. As it outraged or ignored the old constitution of the Church, it could have no legal authority in discipline or government. As it had no first-hand knowledge of Scripture, of antiquity, of the Fathers, it could not possibly decide questions of theology. Its decisions about the Eucharist are of themselves enough to

expose its incompetence : to them, we may add all the popular errors and corruptions which it circulated or winked at. Being mis-led itself, it mis-led Newman and his followers. They accepted the mediæval Church a great deal too easily, and at its own valuation. Since their time, we have learnt to apply a very different standard of knowledge to constitutional history, and to philosophy. Standards at least as high and accurate should be applied to the theology and church history of the middle ages. If the Church and theology of the middle ages will not meet those tests, they must be repudiated : not for the sake of theories, or negative conclusions; but in the interests of older and purer forms of Christianity ; and of Scripture itself, which has borne, and will bear, the most exacting tests. The Church of England is in some danger from an outbreak of mediæval ignorance and superstition ; but the danger of the English-speaking Churches is nothing, compared to the darkness and dangers that encompass Christian-

ity itself, in all those Latin countries, which suffer from a developed and an aggravated form of these mediæval fictions. It is still their hour, and the power of darkness.

But we may now leave these unpleasing and melancholy subjects for a while, and turn away from them to the history of our own Church, until we have brought it down to the century of the Reformation. In the year 597, Augustine, and a small band of missionaries, sent by Gregory I., arrived in Kent, and persuaded Ethelbert, the king, to adopt and tolerate Christianity. Their success had been prepared by Ethelbert's French and Christian wife. Augustine returned to France, and was there made into a bishop. Soon after, the diocese of Canterbury was founded; and, from that foundation, the Church among the English people has had a corporate and constitutional existence, which has never ceased, in spite of many dangers and vicissitudes. After long struggles and many reactions, Christianity made its way

into all the English kingdoms. The English Christians had a conflict as well with those large bodies of Celtic Christians, who remained in Cornwall, in Wales and Cumbria, and along the Scottish border. The whole conflict was ended practically in 664, at the conference of Whitby; and, a few years later, under the good guidance of Archbishop Theodore, the various elements of Scottish, British, and English Christianity were organized into a single Church. This was nearly an hundred and fifty years before the different Saxon and Celtic monarchies were formed into an united kingdom of South Britain, or England. The unity of the British peoples, as a Church, helped to bring about their unity as a nation. The English Church, in its national capacity, is older than the Crown of England, and is nearly six hundred years older than the English Parliament.

Between the year 668, and the Norman Conquest in 1066, the English Church went on its way quietly, and on the whole use-

fully. It reared some good administrators, and some scholars of European fame. The Venerable Bede should never be forgotten, as an honour to English learning in the darkest of the middle ages. The next century produced Alfred, one of the best and greatest of all Kings. There was much personal devotion to the relics and shrines of Rome; and this devotion was made use of to extend the Pope's authority. Pious frauds, as well as legal frauds, were pressed into the service of the Papacy. The devotion of the English took the form of pilgrimages to Rome, and of offerings to the Roman shrines. An hostel was built in Rome for English pilgrims; and was endowed, first by alms, and then by a small tax. Oblations of wax were also made, for lighting the churches of the martyrs. These contributions were annexed by the Pope, and finally exacted as a tribute, under the name of Peter's pence. The official and ecclesiastical connexion with Rome was much less than modern Roman-

ists care to realize, and much more than some Anglicans like to admit. The bishop of Rome exercised the constitutional powers of a Patriarch. In the seventh century, he had not transformed those powers out of recognition. Papal powers, in the modern, and even in the later mediæval sense, were as yet unknown. Thanks to our distance from Rome, and our estranging sea, Papal encroachments, both against the Crown and the Church, were fully developed in France and Germany before they obtained a footing here. The English Kings exercised the Royal Supremacy. Even so late and scrupulous a king as Edward the Confessor used the title 'Vicar of Christ.' Bishops might be appointed without any reference to the Pope. The Councils of the English Church had the utmost freedom of action and discussion, saving always the Supremacy of the Crown. The English clergy were national and free. In spite of periodical agitation by innovators, and so-called reformers, it would seem that most

of the parochial clergy were married; as, too, in many cases, were some of the canons and members of collegiate bodies. We find the King, the nobles, and the bishops discussing both discipline and doctrine. There were no separate church courts. The bishop sat in the ordinary courts, by the earl. The clergy were subject to the laws and customs of the realm. The old Church of England was thoroughly national, and wonderfully free from clericalism. It was the Church of the People, and was not dominated by the clergy. It went through many trials in the long Danish wars, and it emerged from them, as the nation did, more braced than hurt. Both in Church and State, the English People went on steadily in their own way, until the eleventh century, being affected very little by those clerical changes or developments, which were bearing fruit in other countries, and especially in France.

The independence and isolation of the English Church were looked upon with

disfavour by the advancing Papacy; and the Pope did not fail to utilize the Norman expedition for his own advantage. The Conqueror received the Papal blessing, and a sacred banner. If the term had been invented then, as it was a few years later, the assault on England would have been known as a crusade. This is what it was, in effect, so far as the Roman authorities were concerned; and the proof of it is, that Gregory VII. asked the Conqueror for homage and tribute, both as his feudal superior, and in repayment for his support. William refused the homage; because, as he said, 'neither have I promised it, nor do I find that my predecessors did it to yours.' One result of the Conquest was to make the English Church less national, and more clerical. It was modelled after the prevailing continental fashion. The ecclesiastical courts were separated from the civil; but the ordinance, which separated them, and established the church courts, runs solely in the King's name, and rests

only on his authority. Neither in theory, nor in practice, did William allow the Royal Supremacy to be invaded. Nevertheless, the Conquest marks a new stage in the connexion of England with the Papacy. It was made the basis for new encroachments. Through the weakness of some Kings, the necessities of others, and the quarrels between Kings and clergymen, the Papal Supremacy invaded the Royal Supremacy, and the ancient liberties of the English Church, between the Conquest and the Reformation. In the thirteenth century, it made very serious, and almost successful, efforts to abolish the liberties of the whole nation.

The separation of laity and clergy, and the exemption of the clergy from Royal Authority, led to serious abuses. Henry II. tried to make all men equal before the Law, and amenable to justice. He was opposed by one class of his subjects. Through the accident of Becket's death, the resistance of the clergy was successful. That one

class, which should be punished more severely than any other for serious offences, secured their privilege of being criminals not amenable to ordinary Law. They preferred to live under a system, in which dispensations were the rule, and by which fees were exacted instead of punishments. Such immunities, as Becket claimed, were unknown in England before the Conquest. The abuses caused by this supposed victory of the clergy led, more perhaps than any other single cause, to the greater conflict of the Reformation. The principles of Becket were the source of intolerable abuses, and all his arguments have been falsified by long experience. The principles of Henry II. are approved and practised in every civilized country now, without any danger to religion, or any injustice to the clergy. The final victory is with Henry II., and the Laws of England. The immediate victory of Becket only proved, that nothing is more disastrous for a State, and still more for a Church, than a clergy which

considers itself above or outside the Common Law.

One Pope had licensed the Norman conquest. Another gave Ireland to Henry II. The necessities of Richard I., and the mis-rule of John, both added to the Papal influence in England. John, while trying to enslave his People, made himself a vassal of the Pope, and England a fief of the Holy See. He had no constitutional right to do either. Innocent III., instead of rebuking John for violating his coronation oath, accepted the illegal donation, and sent over a Legate to receive it in due form. He always took the part of John, against the English People and their liberties. He condemned Magna Charta, as wrong in itself, and as rebellion against his own illegal rights. John was released from all the engagements he had entered into with his People. In all the puzzling changes of those years, the only constant element of Papal policy seems to be a disregard of all principle. The rights of the

English People were ignored; and the so-called spiritual arbiter judged the whole case solely from the standpoint of his own temporal advantage. By the irony of fate, it is only in countries, which have been formed by this offending Charter, that the adherents of the Pope are now free from undue State control, or from violent political hostility.

During the minority of Henry III., immense efforts were made to extend the Papal tyranny, not only over ecclesiastical, but over temporal, affairs. It was through no negligence of the Popes, that England did not sink into a vassal dependency of Rome. We were saved by the vigour of the Barons, and the patriotism of a few bishops. Among these, Langton the Primate, Cantilupe of Worcester, and Grosseteste of Lincoln, should always be remembered; as well as Hubert de Burgh, and Simon Earl of Leicester. All these men, and their supporters, at various periods of Henry's long reign, defended the liberties

of England, against the Crown and the Papacy. In the reign of Henry, a tribute was demanded from the whole kingdom, by the Pope, as feudal superior. As Head of the Church, he claimed the power of taxing ecclesiastical persons and property. The power of appointing to benefices was claimed also by the Pope, and he gave or sold them continually to foreigners. Benefices were also taxed heavily at every change of occupant. Friars, with special licences and powers, were allowed to carry on their trade in every parish, in spite of the bishops and the parochial clergy. The Monasteries were not only withdrawn from episcopal control, but they were allowed to appropriate livings; and they provided inefficiently, if they provided at all, for the cure of souls. Pardons for almost any crime, and exemptions from every obligation, were to be obtained for money. Papal collectors were over here continually, arranging these financial matters, and exporting their profits to the Roman Court.

To that Court, also, went innumerable appeals; as all serious and paying business was gradually withdrawn to the Papal Curia. This state of things began, for England, with the reign of Innocent III., and it lasted at its height until Boniface VIII. By that time, the Papacy had made itself intolerable. The French King ruined Boniface; and the Popes were then fully occupied with rival claimants for their See. In England, a strong anti-papal opposition was roused and organized, and it never died away. It is recorded in the Statutes of the Realm, and on the Rolls of Parliament. Meanwhile, the discipline and morals of the mediæval Church in England were destroyed, by that period of Papal usurpation; and the Reformation was only a work of time. It was deferred by the hundred years war with France, and then by our dynastic wars. But for these, the Papacy and the Religious Orders would probably have been dealt with before the sixteenth century.

In 1273, the Statute of Mortmain was passed, to check the accumulation of monastic property in land. In 1351 and 1353, Statutes were passed to restrain the worst abuses of Papal patronage, and to check Roman advances on the jurisdiction of the English courts. The speculations of Wyclif, the numbers and activity of his disciples, the revolt of the labourers, the petitions in Parliament, all point to the discontent of the country, to its supposed causes, and to the nature of the remedy. From the time of Wyclif, Reformation was in the air; not only in England, but in many parts of Europe, in those especially where the Hussites carried Wyclif's teaching into practice. The satire of Piers Plowman is a witness to the feeling of England at the close of the fourteenth century. The general Councils, which met in that age, spoke of nothing but Reform, and they tried in vain to begin with the Court of Rome. The mediæval clergy were dying of their own corruption, but, from the

head downwards, they had no healing power in themselves. The course of endowments shows a change in public opinion. If we look at the statistics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we find, that, from the reign of Edward III., schools, colleges, alms houses and hospitals, began to be founded in larger numbers, instead of monasteries and convents. Above all, chantries were founded, in ever growing numbers, and with very evil consequences. Under Henry V., a number of monasteries were dissolved, and given to the Crown. The weakness of the Lancastrian title, the wars and the early death of Henry V., the anarchy and civil wars under Henry VI., the selfishness and sheer wickedness of the Yorkist Princes, all contributed to put off Reform. As a compensation, the Church added to its unpopularity by murders and persecutions, hitherto not known in England, while the clergy were more and more alienated from the life and sympathy of the People. In place of the popular

bishops, who had opposed the Crown and the Pope in the thirteenth century, the bishops of the next age were courtiers, creatures of the Administration; and the English Sees became more and more an appanage of the great families. The feudal churchmen now, like the feudal baronage, had had their day. They had done good work in it, but they were now cumbering the ground. Everything proves, that the English Reformation was no sudden storm, and no mere theological episode. Its causes went deep into every sphere of national and social life. It was a deliberate return to that sounder and more national condition, which had prevailed in Church and State before new, foreign customs were brought in by the Norman and Papal conquest. Before that conquest, the English Church was a member of the Latin Patriarchate. Its relation to Rome hardly changed between the days of Gregory I. and the days of Hildebrand: but, in those five hundred years, the Latin Patriarch

had developed into the mediæval Pope. When the Papal jurisdiction, through the activity and zeal of the Normans, was carried over Europe, England was soon brought into collision with the Roman Church. Its old condition was declared wrong, and even a falling away from ancient purity: whereas it was Rome, and not England, which had innovated or developed. Between the eleventh and the sixteenth centuries, and then only, the English Church was under the dominion and influence of the feudalizing Popes. At the beginning of that epoch, through the mouth of William I., the nation protested against the claims and developments of the feudal Papacy. Communion with the Roman See, and constitutional relations with the Latin Patriarch, are by no means to be confused with servitude to the Roman Curia, or subjection to a feudal Pope.

It is difficult indeed to get below the hierarchy and the outward organization of the Church, and to form any clear notion

of parochial country life, in the middle ages. So far as we can make out, the parishes were, in the truest sense, popular guilds or corporations; owning and administering their own property, through their own elected lay officers. They were neither over-awed by the Patron, nor the Parson. They used their churches and church yards for many corporate and social purposes, which were not strictly ecclesiastical. The sense of corporate ownership and control extended to the vestry and the treasury. Their wealth of art work, in stone, metal, wood, glass, embroidery, and even jewellery, was, we may think, to a large extent, produced by local talent. If so, our own country parishes are far below the level of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The parish was led sometimes, we may be sure, by such a clergyman as Chaucer's Persoun. It was mis-led, no doubt, more often, by the Somnour, the Pardoner, and the Freer. It contained some or all of the sorts and conditions of

men, who made up the remainder of that good company. Between the reign of Alfred and the exhaustion of the fifteenth century, the life of the working people was probably one of substantial comfort, and of much more relaxation, freedom, and variety, than has generally been supposed. To the other troubles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, must be added a decline of trade, and a change in economical conditions. But, when we think of the Black Death, and the Peasants' Rising, and Wyclif, and Langland, we must not forget that the same age produced Wykeham, with all his munificent expenditure; and he was followed, to take only one diocese, by Waynflete, Beaufort, Fox and Wolsey. Up to the year of the Reformation, churches, cathedrals, religious houses, and colleges, were being built or enlarged with more than the old profusion. This may seem curious, at first sight, and even pathetic. It is often asked, why, with such a population, as we suppose mediæval England to

have held, were the country churches so numerous and large? Their size and splendour, I believe, are not to be explained, either by the numbers, or the devotion, of the people; but by the swollen revenues of the clergy, and latterly by the popular discontent both at the clergy and their wealth. Besides, the country churches were all enlarged after the Black Death, when the population had been reduced by, perhaps, an half. It is not unknown, in our own times, that dynasties, on the brink of revolution, have tried to conciliate the labouring class by wages, and the trading classes by reckless and profuse expenditure. The last move, in such a game, is war. It was made by the English Prelates against the Lollards, then against the early Lutherans, and at the end against the new learning. When the English hierarchy was beaten and disarmed, and the Papal army of Monks and Friars was annihilated, the war was organized from Rome, and waged

against the free and progressive part of the English nation.

With Henry VIII., we seem to enter a new and a larger world. Indeed, a new world was opening in every sense, at the dawn of the sixteenth century. Columbus had found another continent, although the Theologians had proved it could not exist. Copernicus had enlarged men's notions of the material universe. Constantinople had fallen in 1453, and its Greek treasures were scattered over Europe. Printing enabled all this fresh knowledge to be circulated wholesale. The recovery of Greek re-opened the old world of human experience and thought. It not only restored old knowledge, and larger ways of conceiving life; but it recovered that free, flexible, reasonable tone of mind, which was the strength and glory of the ancient world. There was nothing, which it seemed impossible to think and do. The nations of the West were able at last to escape out of their mediæval prison; to judge the world

and the past by a standard larger and truer than their own. Their perspective was put nearly right, and weapons almost of precision were put into their hands. The original New Testament was restored to them, as well as a knowledge of Christian antiquity, and of the great Fathers. They were able to breathe the free air of primitive Christianity. When the mediæval Church was dead, and putrefying, when clerical abuses had become intolerable, the remedy was found. It is an idle controversy, as to whether the people of the middle ages had, or had not, the Bible. Supposing they had it, and used it freely, as some Roman controversialists try to prove, it was of little use to them so long as they could only read it through mediæval glasses. The clergy were in the same case, in spite of their close knowledge and frequent use of Bible texts. They had no clue to Scripture or church history, until Greek learning and methods were restored. It was by that learning, and through those

methods, that the English Reformers were directed. The Reformation of the English Church, on its positive side, was above all things, an appeal to sound learning, against mediæval corruption and ignorance. On its negative side, it was a repudiation of corrupt practices, and of corrupt doctrine, based on ignorance, on the most childish and ludicrous want of scholarship and morals.

There are three or four stages and elements in the English Reformation, which must not be confused. First there was the King's divorce, which added a strong personal element to the ecclesiastical difference with the Pope. Following this, and embittered by it, was the repudiation of the Papal claims, and the re-establishment of the Royal Supremacy. Next, there was the Reformation proper of the English Church, in doctrine, discipline, and constitution. Depending from this, was the dissolution of the Religious Orders, and the resumption of their property. First, as to the Divorce: I

must leave every partizan to settle for himself how far the first divorce of Henry VIII. was, or was not, the sole cause of the English Reformation. It seems to me an idle question. Those, who discuss it, merely prove that they can't, or won't, understand what the English Reformation was: but there are one or two fallacies, which usually are latent in all such discussions, and which we may as well expose. It is argued, too often, by Roman advocates, that England was lost because the then Pope would not, or could not, dissolve the Sacrament of matrimony. They forget, that the whole dispute turned on the previous question, whether this marriage were indeed valid and sacramental. It is an unfortunate thing, no doubt, but just at the time when the Pope's jurisdiction and powers came to be challenged by all men openly, the King of England had a personal cause, which depended on the validity and extent of both. First, the Pope's powers: Had the Pope really power to allow Henry

to marry his brother's widow? On this question, in the abstract, the Theologians were by no means agreed. Further, were the dispensing documents themselves legal and in order? This question was by no means cleared up. And, more important, was the sole condition, on which Pope Julius had based his dispensation, broken or not broken? If Katharine's marriage with Prince Arthur had been consummated, even Julius owned he would not and could not dispense. The evidence, I think, is against Katharine, and in favour of the Prince; and so are all the customs of the age. Against these, is only Katharine's oath, and that is not worth considering. The adherents of a Dispensing Power have no right to be dispensed, and to be believed. Secondly, it is often urged, 'The Pope would never have lost England, if he could have kept it lawfully by so simple a process as divorcing one woman. You see, therefore, how inflexible the Roman Church is in up-

holding matrimony.' It is always forgotten, that Katharine was the Emperor's Aunt, as well as Henry's Sister-in-law: that the Emperor was pledged to support his Aunt, and that he also held the Pope himself, and the Papal States, absolutely at his disposal. For the Pope, it was not a question between losing England and divorcing a King's wife. It was not even a question of risking England or risking the whole dominions of Charles V. It was a question of obeying Charles, or of remaining a prisoner, ruining the prospects of the Medici in Italy, and of losing the Papal States and Capital. The Pope decided precisely as we should expect, knowing him, his advisers, and his circumstances. Moreover, Henry knew very well how easy and how frequent divorces were, even in his own family. His sister, Margaret, the widow of James IV., made a second marriage, and soon desired a third. She obtained a divorce from her second husband solely on the pretence, that the death of James IV. was not proved.

If it had not been for the Emperor, there can be no doubt that Henry would have obtained a divorce without the least difficulty, even though his wife had not also been his brother's widow. On Henry's side, there was, I believe, a genuine scruple about his relation to Katharine, aggravated by the deaths of many children. There was also the very grave problem of the succession, in view of his only heir being an unhealthy girl. From the death of Richard II., to the accession of James I., the succession to the Crown was always a menace to the country. This alone, had the Pope been a free agent, would probably have been thought a sufficient reason for invalidating any Royal marriage. Furthermore, there was the unprecedented course, insisted on by the Emperor, that Henry's trial should be in Rome, and that he should be summoned there personally. That forced upon Henry and his advisers the question whether the sovereign rights of the Crown, were compatible with Papal

claims. When the King saw that the Pope was an unjust judge, and not a free agent, he was not slow to question the validity of his claim to be a judge at all. Henry had, I believe, a good, and, at first, an honest case. He spoiled it by bringing Anne Boleyn into it, and by his own ungenerous behaviour; but these faults, deplorable as they were, do not affect those broad principles, which were brought to an issue by the question of Henry's divorce, and by the way in which it was dealt with. Unhappy as the divorce was in itself, and in the way it was handled here, the handling of it by Rome was far more disgraceful; and its existence at all was due to that Pope, who first allowed so scandalous a marriage. This divorce is damaging to two Popes, and to the procedure of the Roman courts. It also shows that the Temporal Power is the greatest obstacle to a Pope's freedom. The divorce did not cause, though undoubtedly it precipitated, the English Reformation, and

especially the relations of the Crown and Church to the bishops of Rome. In 1531, Convocation addressed Henry as Head of the Church and clergy. Next year, the spiritual courts were purged. They had been oppressive to religious inquirers, and lax to moral delinquents. In 1533, appeals to Rome were forbidden, all fines and taxes were soon abolished, and the appointment of bishops provided for by the King's authority. The independent legislative power of Convocation was abolished. This legislation was accepted by the whole body of English bishops, including Fisher. A great many superstitions and corruptions were suppressed, and the whole order of public worship was reformed. This was done with a scrupulous regard for ancient usage; and every thing, whether in belief or practice, was referred to antiquity, or to Scripture as the final test. Every thing, which could not meet that test, was judged to be merely human. It might be advisable, as a matter of sentiment and

order. It could not be binding as a matter of conscience or belief. If this distinction had been remembered, most of the separations and persecutions of the next hundred years might have been avoided. If it were acted on at present, the whole of our troubles and quarrels would vanish of themselves. It must not be supposed, that these changes happened without much alarm, and some opposition. Timid people did not know where change would end; as though change were not inherent in all human things, and most of all in the Papal Church. Many could not see where an apparent change was a return to something old and better, or where it was the introduction of something unsound and new. The partizans, who clung to Rome, could not foresee how Rome was going to develop, at the Council of Trent, nor how the mediæval developments of Rome were going to be exposed.

There were three men living under Henry VIII., who are typical of the whole English Reformation. Erasmus gave us

the Greek Testament, with an admirable commentary. He also gave us editions of the great Fathers; and, in his Colloquies, he lashed the abuses of his age, especially the clerical abuses. He was a happy mixture of wit and piety. Sir Thomas More drew the picture of an ideal State. In so doing, he lashed his age even more severely than Erasmus had. He also pointed to a great many social reforms: some of them have been realized: others are still only socialistic dreams; though perhaps realizable through Christian methods, and in a Christian temper. More represents the social and practical influence of the English Church. The teacher of both Erasmus and More was Colet, Dean of St. Paul's. He founded St. Paul's School for the encouragement of Greek and science. He founded Lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul. Scripture had been regarded by the mediæval teachers either as an armoury for theological missiles, or as a collection of mystical devotions. Colet saw that

Scripture was something more than a collection of texts. He saw that it had an historical as well as a devotional sense. He is the founder of modern scriptural interpretation, in which the English Church has been so fruitful of good work. The three latest and greatest representatives of it, Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, and Dr. Hort, are curiously similar to their three great predecessors. We find in them the same rigorous examination of the text, the same historical and firm presentation, the same social effort. In Dr. Hort, we find the same keen wit and intellect, which are conspicuous in More. In all six men, we find that same dislike of narrow partizanship, which has always been a note of the English Church. The Church of England was reformed in the interests, and by means, of sound learning. She was to be a co-partner with the nation in spreading, instead of opposing, the new growth and freedom of our human rights and powers. More, Colet, and Erasmus are

particularly interesting, over and above their personal gifts and graces, because they reveal to us what the new learning might have done, had it been able to influence enlightened men, formed by all that was best in the mediæval traditions, and not tainted or soured by those narrow and reactionary elements, which spoilt so much of the Reformation, and so many of the Reformers. Colet died before the repudiation of the Papacy; but we know how he desired to see the things which were coming, and how his own works agree with them.

It will, probably, be asked, 'How can the Church of England claim Sir Thomas More, since he died for the Pope?' Well, the Pope shall have all the credit of his death; but, I think we may in this case appeal to More's judgment, even against himself. We know, that he was much troubled by the Papal claims. He is said to have given many years to the study of them. He was a lawyer, very legal in his

mind and methods. It is certain he must have studied those claims in the current law books of the mediæval Church. They all derived the Papal claims from the False Decretals. From the lawyers, they passed into Aquinas, and other theologians. It is doubtful whether More's reading took him outside those text books; and if so, his authorities and precedents were also tampered with. The case would come to him as above all things a legal case; and he had no suspicion, that his authorities were vitiated at their source; or that the title deeds were altogether fraudulent. Had he suspected, we can hardly doubt the conclusion to which his honest and clear mind would have brought him. The final exposure of the Decretals was not published until early in Elizabeth's reign, by the Centuriators. It is marvellous how sound were the instincts of the first generation of Anglican Reformers; and how their deductions, based often on hints and half-knowledge, were confirmed by a truer

knowledge of the documents and facts. It was not until after the labours of Scaliger and Casaubon, that the full measure of mediæval imposture and forgery was known.

> 'Step after step,
> Through many voices crying right and left,
> Have I climb'd back into the primal church,
> And stand within the porch, and Christ with me.'

That was the end set before themselves by Cranmer and his fellow workers. They strove to attain it with utter honesty, carrying their lives in their hands. Much as we may admire their honesty and courage; and I can admire both, in Cranmer, in spite of all that may be said; we owe even more admiration, I think, to their learning, obtained through so many difficulties, used with so much sobriety, and guided often by an instinct or insight, which amounts to genius. Latimer, I admire in another way; as I admire Knox and Wyclif. They are burning and shining lights: testifying, like the

Prophets, against wickedness and injustice in holy places. I should honour such masters of great English, in spite of all they said and did, if I could not honour them still more because of it.

The question of the Religious Orders is really a question of finance and of the Sovereign Powers of the nation. The whole revenue of the English Church, from endowments, at the time of the Reformation, amounted to 320,280*l.* a year. This accounts only for the endowments and fixed revenues of the clergy. We must add to it the earnings and extortions of the Friars, the voluntary offerings at Easter and other festivals, the stole fees for administering the Sacraments, the mortuary dues, the death bed bequests, the payments for masses, and all the numerous methods of revenue, which the Catholic system invariably favours, and which are especially profitable to the Religious Orders. To these again, we must add all the fines and fees exacted in the Spiritual Courts. These

unfixed revenues might, possibly, almost equal the revenue from endowments. We shall be quite safe if we estimate them at one-half of the fixed revenue, and thus bring up the whole annual income of the clergy to 480,420*l.*; or, say, half a million a year. The whole revenue of the Government has been estimated at 125,000*l.* a year. The revenue of the Crown, from domains and taxes, must not be confused with the national income. Allowing for exaggeration on one side, and minimising on the other, it is clear that the revenues of the clergy were out of all proportion to the needs and resources of the country. They were, too, a source of weakness. The clergy were so heavily taxed by Rome, that they could not pay their due share of taxes to the Crown, which was thus far impoverished and weakened. The Friars, with their vast property and earnings, were not taxed at all. The whole amount paid to the absentee Sovereign in Rome was a dead loss to the kingdom. Half, at least, of the

endowed property of the clergy belonged to the Religious Orders; and probably much more than half of the unfixed revenue found its way to them. We might say they possessed 350,000*l.* a year. We can multiply the money of Henry VIII. by ten or twelve, to represent its spending power, and bring it to something like our current values. I will multiply by ten. The income of the Monks, Friars, and Nuns, then, amounted to 3,500,000*l.* annually, of our money, in spending power. The revenues of the Crown were only 1,250,000*l.* I have noticed already how the taste for religious houses and the monastic life declined after the fourteenth century. Some houses, too, had been suppressed. Some were bankrupt. Very few were being founded. But, if we look into the numbers of Monks in existing houses, we find a still graver and more significant falling off. At Saint Albans, only thirty-seven Benedictines enjoyed a revenue of 20,000*l.* a year: at Bury, forty-five managed to live on the

same amount. The income of Glastonbury was more than 30,000*l.* a year. I take these three as the most powerful monasteries, and the most revered monastic shrines, in the whole country. If they could scarcely keep their communities going, in spite of an easy rule and all the advantages they had to offer, we can imagine the state of the poorer and inferior foundations. It is difficult to say why two dozen clergymen should require 20,000*l.* a year to practise poverty. Putting all questions of immorality and abuses on one side, it is clear that the monastic system in England was dead; or, at any rate, that the system was endowed far beyond its requirements, or its health. Neither was it serving those useful purposes, which had endeared it to an earlier time. After all, the reports of Cromwell's visitors are not more damaging to the Orders, than the report of Cardinal Morton's visitation under Henry VII. The verdict of the English Government is borne out by the public opinion of all men on

the Continent, even of the ecclesiastical authorities. No report, no rumour, is really so damaging to the English convents as the fact that the Black Book of Cromwell's Visitors was destroyed, and not exposed, by the advisers of Queen Mary. The monastic revenues, then, were taken by the Government: the houses were suppressed: the inhabitants were pensioned. It was fortunate, indeed, that Henry did not annex these revenues to the Crown. Some of them were used in forts and arsenals. The bulk of them were granted to private owners; and the families thus founded became leaders of the country, against Charles I. and James II. Had the monasteries been suppressed before the Wars of the Roses, they would probably have enriched the great families, to the danger of the whole country. In our own days, the revenues and fabrics would have been devoted to education, churches, hospitals, or charity. In the sixteenth century, a little was done in some of those

directions, but all such wants were adequately provided for in other ways. With a population of between three and four millions only, to provide for, it is difficult to see how the monastic revenues could have been devoted to charity, without doing more harm than good. Those who received them did immense service to the country: a service only possible, in those days, by strengthening the particular class which did it. We owe much to the Tudor Sovereigns for giving us a strong central government, under which the power of the Commons could rise once more, as against the lawless and disruptive powers of the old nobility. The new families, established by Henry VIII. out of the monastic property, were the backbone of the Commons in the revolutions of the seventeenth century. They were also a firm barrier against reaction in the first age of the Reformation. Henry VIII. gave us the supporters of Elizabeth, and the opponents of the Stuarts. It would not be questioned, I suppose, by

any one, that the nation had the fullest right to deal with the persons and property of the Religious Orders, unless their thought were confused or frightened by the term 'Religious.' It is open to discussion, I think, how far those Orders were, properly speaking, clerical bodies, or how far they were in reality great lay corporations, some of whose members were in Holy Orders. But, granting that the Religious Orders had become, in the fullest sense, clerical, the policy of dealing with them brings the dispute between the Civil and the Ecclesiastical Power to the plainest issue. Had the Crown power lawfully, or had it not, to deal with those persons in their corporate capacity, and with that property: the said property being, to a large extent, at the disposal of a foreign and hostile Power, and the persons being his blind or willing agents? In other words, was the Government of England to be in reality a Sovereign Power, or was it to be dependent on the Pope? To manage such

affairs through Rome, or with the approval of Rome, is really to be dependent on it. It is an enormous assumption, to argue, that an Ecclesiastical Power, whether inside or outside a country, is necessarily or exclusively 'spiritual,' and that the Civil Power can not be 'spiritual.' Surely every Governing Authority, which makes for righteousness, directly or indirectly, which guards truth and justice, which secures order and education, which cares for the public health, is a 'Spiritual' Power, and is 'ordained of God.' No Ecclesiastical Power can do more, or advance any higher title. When Saint Paul spoke thus of Cæsar's Government, I imagine he was contrasting the *Pax Romana* with the mis-rule of Jewish fanatics, Cilician pirates, Phrygian robbers, Macedonian bandits; and that he wished to demonstrate how such an authority was more an instrument of God, than even the ecclesiastical or 'spiritual' Council at Jerusalem. Will any one pretend, that a Government, which secures the *Pax*

Britannica is not more 'spiritual' and godly, than the old Administration of the Papal States? Is it possible to describe our own Government, either with regard to its aims and functions, or to the character of those who administer it, as less 'spiritual' than the barbarous ecclesiastical Governments of the middle ages? To act as though no civil and lay authority could be 'spiritual,' to argue as though every clerical and ecclesiastical authority must be 'spiritual,' is to go back to the crudest stage of mediæval ignorance. To confuse the terms 'spiritual' and 'ecclesiastical,' which have too often been exclusive of one another, is to misunderstand the first principles of Christianity.

But, with regard to the English Religious Orders, besides the economical and financial problems connected with their existence, there are other questions of principle, which account for, and justify, their abolition. First, the Monks and their monasteries had long survived their use.

They were out of touch with the national life, and they had retarded its progress. They were a burden on the land, and they were the last owners to free their serfs. In many cases, the Abbeys stood in the way of all progress and freedom, in the towns which had grown up beneath them. In the risings under Richard II., the feeling of monastic serfs and tenants was shown plainly; and the want of feeling in the Monks is shown by the fearful retaliations which were made in their interests, and commended in their Chronicles. The remembrance of those things had not died away. It was kept active by the preaching, and the persecution, of the Lollards. In many cases, the destruction of monastic property was a popular vengeance, long delayed, but done thoroughly and heartily at last. Besides the populace, the bishops and Parish clergy were no friends to the Monks or Friars. The exemption of the monasteries had been a serious aggression, by the Pope, on the old authority of

bishops. The acquisition of patronage and livings by the Monks was a grievous wrong to the parish clergy, and to their parishioners. The Friars, with their roving licences, and their questionable devotions, defied episcopal authority, and literally starved the parochial clergy. The bishops, naturally, left the Religious Orders to their fate. Neither they nor the lower clergy were sorry to see the end of them. Moreover, besides the injuries to the diocesan and parochial systems, besides all the money the Orders exported to Rome, the Monks and Friars themselves were a Papal army of occupation; supported by the Pope, and supporting him in turn; opposed, therefore, to all reform, especially of the Pope's authority; and willing, in defence of it, to set the kingdom in a blaze, by allying themselves either with rebels or invaders. They were really schismatics or dissenters, not from the creed, but from the organization, of the English Church. To show how the Papal system worked in

detail, with regard to finance and loyalty: under Edward III. we were at war with France, and the Pope was an instrument of the French King; yet he not only drained enormous revenues from England, which found their way, some of them, into our enemies' exchequer; but he appointed foreigners, resident or non-resident, to innumerable benefices; he had a practical veto on the appointment of bishops, upon whom our defence and administration depended largely; and he drew more treasure out of the country to his Curia, by law suits, besides receiving all his annates, tenths, first-fruits, and other dues gathered by his collectors. The Religious, in addition, who were subject to alien, that is to French, Superiors, exported large sums annually into that country, with which we were at war. These things were complained of grievously under Edward III., and Richard II. The alien monasteries were suppressed under Henry V. Taking every thing into account, the wonder is

that the Religious Orders, with all their abuses and anomalies, were endured so long. It is often asserted, that the Parish livings were plundered by lay Patrons, at the Reformation. The truth is, the lay Patrons merely stepped into the place of the deposed Abbot or Prior. The Religious Orders, and not the Crown or the Reformers, were the robbers of parochial endowments. It is often said, again, that the bishops were enslaved at the Reformation. On the other hand, since the Conquest, the English bishops, as far as their spiritual functions are concerned, had never been so much masters of their own dioceses and courts as they became under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. It was the Pope, and not the Crown, which diminished the Episcopal office and authority. Such parts of it, as the Crown retained, had been annexed long before by the mediæval Popes. The legislative power of Convocation was reduced. In this, I see nothing more than a security

for the lay members of the Church, the majority; and for the Sovereign rights of the nation, which includes, and does not exclude, the clergy. Besides, will any one contend, that Convocation, before 1530, was independent from all control, that it could make what laws it chose? The Pope would soon have shown how little freedom it possessed, either in opinions or practice, in any thing beyond the emptiest routine. The Royal Supremacy protected the clergy from Papal interference; and, as long as the clergy were in sympathy with the nation, the Royal Supremacy was a guarantee for the perfect freedom of the Church. If the clergy be in opposition to the laity, and yet wish to legislate irresponsibly, as they choose, there is no escape from two obvious conclusions; first, the Church, in the majority of its members, is not free; secondly, a rival and an independent sovereignty is established against the Crown.

The English Reformation was a long

process, going through many experiments, advancing and receding, influenced from without and from within. It began in 1529. It was not finished until 1662. So far as we have gone, the Crown had vindicated its old supremacy, over all persons and causes within its own dominions. Henry VIII. exercised no powers, which had not been exercised by the early Kings, or by the early Emperors, before the Papacy. The English Church asserted and re-gained those old liberties, which all Churches had by right, and used by law, at the time when Christianity became a State religion. There were few points, perhaps, in which the laws and liberties of the English Church, after 1529, differed from those of the Church before the Conquest. In doctrine and ritual, the Reformers went back, as far as possible, to the standard of the primitive Church, rejecting mediæval innovations. There are four stages in the Roman development, which must be separated in thought, if we would understand the Anglican position.

There is, first of all, the Bishoprick of Rome, between 323 and the close of Justinian's reign. In that period, the Bishop of Rome was one among four or five Patriarchs, with co-ordinate and equal powers, and all recognizing the Imperial Supremacy, which was the bond of unity, and the source of jurisdiction and of order. In those days, the civil authority was recognized by all men as spiritual, and 'of God.' There was, secondly, the period between 565 and 1061. In this period, the Latin Patriarch stood alone, cut off from the Greeks, the chief authority left among the Barbarians. He extended his patriarchal powers, and developed the mediæval Papacy. In the early part of this period, the EnglishChurch was organized, and entered into those legal relations with the Patriarch, which prevailed under Gregory I. This was the utmost extent of Roman jurisdiction, which the English nation or Church ever accepted willingly, and perhaps legally. Between 1061 and 1300, the mediæval Papacy

developed into the feudal Papacy of Hildebrand, Innocent III., Boniface VIII. This feudal Papacy encroached on the English Church, as on all other European Churches. In this period, new doctrines were defined, new discipline was imposed, and the whole constitution and conception of the Church were transformed almost out of recognition. The developments of the Papacy were serious enough, as against national Churches, and the clergy. They were still more serious and unlawful, as against the civil power. England met the whole course of this development with constitutional protests. She did what she could to resist it. The resistance was not of much practical use at the time, though it was not altogether void. It was, however, of the greatest use to the Church of the Sixteenth Century. It served to define the old powers of the Crown, and the old relations of the Church to the Latin Patriarch. It enabled the Reformers to appeal behind the feudal Papacy, to an older, freer, and purer state.

They could point to Rome as the innovator, the aggressor, and take their stand upon the early constitution of the Church. It was the feudal Papacy, in its decrepitude and putrefaction, that the English nation and Church renounced. They went back, very nearly, to the state of things which prevailed in the second period of the Latin Patriarchate, when Gregory I. was reigning. This, at least, was the desire of Henry and his advisers. That the position was not accepted by Rome, that no other European Church has yet followed our example, is no argument at all against the lawfulness of the Anglican position, or against the soundness of our principle. Every thing, which has happened since, justifies our position and our principle. The Church of England stands where it did, though with many descendants and allies; all witnessing against the later stages of Roman development, just as the Eastern Churches witness against the earlier. Rome passed on from its feudal stage, to the period of Trent, which,

again, was nothing less than a transformation. Since then, it has gone on to the Vatican Decrees. We are too near them, to decide whether they complete the Tridentine period, or begin another. At any rate, they show that the same authority, which in 1415 defined Councils to be above Popes, could in 1870 define Popes to be above Councils; and yet be infallible in both centuries. From any share in these contradictions, in these further developments from the text of Saint Matthew, the English Church and People were saved by Henry VIII. He has been the victim of endless controversy, and he has been particularly unfortunate in his advocates. Distorted as many of Mr. Froude's details and deductions are, I think his general position and conclusions are unassailable. Henry was a strong man, who guided us through a terrible crisis without disaster, and did a rough and necessary piece of work with as little suffering as was possible, in that age, and with those agents. He saved us from civil

war, and from invasion. The executions in his reign must never be judged without a minute knowledge of the plots and parties within the realm, and of the designs of our various foreign enemies. Gray's estimate, made long before we were troubled with conflicting evidence and contemporary documents, is perhaps not far from the truth in which historians will rest. He numbers Henry, among the royal benefactors to Cambridge, as

> The majestic Lord,
> That broke the bonds of Rome.

We have no right to accept that freedom, and to make no allowance for the dangers and difficulties of those who gained it. After all, nothing greater has been done in the history of England: nothing which has contributed so largely to make us and the peoples descended from us, what we are. The present state of the Latin Church, and some of the Latin peoples, should not diminish our gratitude to Henry VIII.

Under Edward VI., the nation fell into the hands of men, who used religion as a pretext for their own advancement. The extreme Protestant faction made a bad and greedy use of their opportunities. We need only remark, that the extreme Reformers were never able to insert their private opinions into the official declarations of the Church. When Mary succeeded, the Romanizing party had their fling. The Church was packed with its adherents and supporters. There had been no national feeling for the Pope in 1529. There was, no doubt, a faction which desired his authority in 1553. All the statutes passed against him were repealed next year, and the statutes for persecuting heretics were revived. Between 1555 and 1558, about three hundred persons were burnt in England. Our experience of the counter-Reformation was slight and short. As many victims, almost, have been displayed on a single Spanish holiday. Mary was Spanish, and not

English. She made England a satellite of Spain, and reduced us to the lowest and weakest state we ever reached. She did her country the service of showing it what the new Roman Catholicism of Trent and the Jesuits was, and what its methods were. The country has never un-learned her lesson.

When Elizabeth succeeded, she resolved to be Queen of the whole nation, and not a leader of any faction. In a few years she restored finance, order, and prosperity. The debased coinage was recalled. The public credit was revived. The forts and arsenals were repaired and stocked. With great skill, she steered through many difficulties, and avoided war with any of her numerous enemies. She used the time thus gained, to heal the wounds and factions of the country, as far as possible. The Act of Supremacy was restored, giving the nation sovereign power over its own goods and subjects. The Act of Uniformity in worship was

passed, establishing the reformed Prayer Book. This policy was accepted by a large majority of the nation. Out of 9,000 clergy, only 200 resigned, or were expelled. The vast majority of people were content to worship in their Parish churches. The few, who held aloof, were not disturbed as long as they were peaceful subjects. If Elizabeth's policy could have been maintained for one whole generation, we should probably have been afflicted by no English Roman Catholic sect or body, but only by insignificant and isolated individuals. Her success was displeasing and alarming to Pius V., who issued a Bull, in 1570, deposing the Queen, and releasing her subjects from their allegiance. From that time onwards, the Pope was allied with, or instigated, all our foreign enemies; the King of Spain, the House of Guise in France, and their poor tool in Scotland, Mary Stuart. A small number of English Romanists accepted the Bull, and left the national Church. Of these new Romanists,

or Papists, there were two factions. One of them wished only to go on their own way quietly, following their un-instructed conscience in religion, and in other matters being loyal to their country. They had no sympathy with the violent, or political, Romanists, who were led by the Jesuits, allied with all our foreign enemies, and supporters of any claimant to the throne. All Roman Catholics loyal to the Government were teased, and sometimes betrayed, by that school of traitors. One of them, Father Tichborne, a Jesuit, wrote of a loyal Romanist, 'Sir Thomas Tresham as a friend of the state is holden among us for an atheist, and all others of his humour either so or worse.' This was their temper towards those of their own religion, who would not participate in crime. They, themselves, stuck at nothing. Between 1570 and 1603, Elizabeth's life was attempted eight times. Within a few years, two Kings of France, and the heroic Prince of Orange were assassinated, besides other

such noble victims as Coligny and the Regent Moray. The massacre of Saint Bartholomew was conceived, and carried out. Our own Gunpowder Plot was conceived. In face of these violent and unscrupulous attacks, Elizabeth's advisers were exceedingly mild and patient. The penal code was more rigorous in theory than in practice. From the publication of the Bull in 1570, to the year 1581, only three Romanists were executed under the Penal Laws. From 1581, to the destruction of the Armada, Elizabeth was fighting for life with the Pope and Philip. Her enemies were more active, and more treacherous. Severe measures were more frequent. But, considering the greatness of the struggle, and the vile means to which the enemy condescended, Elizabeth executed very few Romanists. Those few were not executed for religion, but for active treason, or for being allied with enemies of the State in time of rebellion and war. The Pope's Bull and the Jesuit

methods are responsible for the death of every Romanist, who suffered under Elizabeth. Many of the loyal Romanists were great personal friends and favourites of the Queen. One of them, Lord Howard of Effingham, led her ships against the Armada. The King of Spain, the Pope, and his Jesuit agents, fought their hardest to put down the English Reformation. In striking at Elizabeth, they struck through her at civil, intellectual, and religious liberty all over Europe. Elizabeth was in the forefront of the battle. She rendered loyal service to others, who were in the fight; to the Dutch Republic, and the great Prince of Orange; to the French Huguenots, and Henry of Navarre. She supported the hero Knox, and his brethren in Scotland; though perhaps she received more help, than she gave, from that indomitable man. Her enemies fought foully, like the liars and criminals they were, both with plots and libels. Elizabeth struck her enemies, and ours, very hard,

but she never condescended to their methods of poison and cold steel.

She had also to oppose an enemy upon the other wing. If the Papists fought foully, the extreme Puritans opposed her with a folly that was much the same as crime. No modern Ritualist was ever more childish in craving for ceremonies, than some of the Elizabethan Protestants were in rejecting them. Elizabeth dreaded the factions and wars that had been caused in other countries by similar trifles. She saw that they were made a pretext for endless battles and divisions, and she resolved at all costs that outward uniformity should be maintained in the national Church. She knew that a nation of warring sects would soon be devoured piecemeal by Rome, the common enemy; and she was right, both in her judgment, and her procedure, according to the standard of those days. No inquisition was made into opinions; but organization, noise, and aggressive acts were punished

rigorously. The policy and the precedent are not inapplicable now, to either wing. No doubt the Puritan quarrels, over matters that were not essential, would have imperilled our liberties and our national existence, if they had not been checked. To have humoured the Puritans, would have been to alienate a much larger section, and have strengthened the party of Mary Stuart. The great body of the Puritans, as well as the great majority of Anglican Catholics, recognized the danger, and had the wisdom to accept Elizabeth's healing measures.

The Church of England is often called a compromise, and nothing is more untrue. The meaning of the term 'Comprehension' is seldom comprehended. The Church compromises with nothing that is contrary to her principles and spirit, with nothing that is destructive to her existence. Since 1530, she has made no terms with the Roman Bishops and their claims. Nothing can be more uncompromising than her

resistance. She has made no terms with Calvin's doctrines of Predestination. The great work of Hooker remains as the monument of her resistance to the doctrines and discipline of Geneva. She can make no terms with Unitarians; because she says that Christ's Divinity, the confession of Saint Peter, is the very foundation of his Church; but with differences of detail or of minor opinions, she has been very tolerant. If people have gone out on these, it has usually been their own doing. She has, very rightly, been even more tolerant still of individual opinion. Nor has she ever set up herself for being infallible. She has always professed to go back to Scripture, interpreting Scripture by early practice and belief, to the best of her knowledge. And she has not allowed her knowledge to stagnate, and grow obsolete. She has always been ready, and is ready still, to submit her decisions to a full and free council of the whole Church, assembled in all its

branches. This is the logical corollary to that reverence for sound learning, with which she started as the basis and the explanation of her Reform.

Such is the learned, wise, and really national Church, that we owe to Queen Elizabeth. She secured it for us against a zealous, but narrow faction, supported by many bishops, and by some of her chief advisers; and also against the reactionary wishes of the uneducated majority. To these, she gave time to think and learn, to realize that the changes they feared were not so alarming and revolutionary after all. The creeds remained to them, and the sacraments, and the outward order of the Church. They possessed the English Bible, and they came to love their services in English. In the end, before Elizabeth died, after nearly half a century of experience, the majority acquiesced with fervour in her wise and sound arrangement, which was so thoroughly English, in the best meaning of the word.

We owe to Elizabeth, the Act of Uniformity, behind which there should be no appeal, either to the Prayer Books it superseded, or still less to any mediæval precedents in belief and ritual. What would be thought of an Army, in which any officer gave himself a licence to ignore the standing orders; to defy all the existing regulations, and to drill or clothe himself, at his individual fancy, according to fashions and ways long obsolete; on the pretence, that such old uniforms and postures had not been expressly and singly repealed? This absurdity is precisely similar, so far as I can see, to the position of those Victorian clergy, who appeal behind the Act of Uniformity, as amended in 1662, to the obsolete practices and ritual of the mediæval Church. Their appeal rests, as I understand, on some doubtful rubrics, and upon one canon passed under Henry VIII. All access to these, one should have thought, was blocked by the two subsequent Acts of Uniformity.[1]

[1] See note on p. 233.

Under Elizabeth, the Royal Supremacy was defined in terms, which have not since been changed. 'The King's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought not, to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.' So runs the opening clause of Article XXXVII. It may be remarked, first, that in this Article there is no mis-use of terms. The Estates of the Realm are contrasted as Ecclesiastical and Civil. It is not said, and is not I think implied, that the Civil Estates are not also Spiritual, because they do not include ecclesiastical persons; though, as a matter of fact, one of them does include the bishops. It might as reasonably be argued, that the Civil Estates are not Christian, as that they are not Spiritual. In the next place, the Sovereign authority is asserted and maintained as against 'any foreign jurisdiction.' It is not maintained against the Laws

of England, as they may be interpreted from time to time. The Royal Supremacy does not, as such, depend on the Establishment or non-Establishment of any religious body. It is just as valid in such 'other of the King's dominions' as those Colonies, in which there is no Established Church, as in the island of Great Britain, in which are two Churches by Law Established. The Royal Supremacy is just as valid over the persons and properties of all Dissenters from those two Established Churches, as it is over any of their members. Establishment, here or elsewhere, means that a certain Church or religious body enters into a contract with the State, and engages to express its beliefs in certain forms, accepted by both sides; and to perform its worship in a certain recognized and legal way. The officers of the Established body undertake certain legal duties, and receive a legal position in virtue of performing them legally. It may, or may not, be a position of advantage. It must be a position of responsibility; and

the responsibility is shared by both parties to the contract. It is equally binding on them both. Within the limits of belief and worship, as prescribed by Law, the officers and members of an Established Church are amenable to Law. But all officials and members of un-Established Churches are amenable to Law, in all questions relating to persons and property; and questions of property and persons, in the case of religious bodies, often turn on questions of belief. The Royal Supremacy, therefore, has often, indirectly, to decide what is, or is not, the belief of a non-Established religious body. As an instance, some few years ago, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church at the Cape was deposed for denying the person of the Evil Spirit. He fought the case, against his Presbytery, his ecclesiastical authority, before the Queen's Judges at the Cape; and then he brought it into England. Lord Westbury decided it finally, on appeal, in the Privy Council. Now what Lord Westbury decided cannot affect, one way or the other, the person of the Devil. That

must remain unaltered, in itself, by any human decision. What he decided, as a Lawyer, was the interpretation to be put on the formularies of the Reformed Dutch Church, about this particular question; and whether the opinions of the deposed Minister agreed or did not agree with those formularies, which he had undertaken to observe. Lord Westbury may have been right or wrong in his decision; but his decision cannot alter those facts, which were behind the question in dispute. An un-Established Church does not, therefore, escape such questions, and it has often to bring them before the Civil Courts. I would go on to argue, that, with regard to our own Established Church, the Courts have never gone further than Lord Westbury went in this case. So far as I can see, they have never defined nor altered any article of the Christian faith. They have only decided the legal meaning of the Anglican formularies; and the further question, whether the utterances or practices of this or that accused person are, or are not, in agree-

ment with those formularies. Their decision may be right or wrong. It cannot affect the truths, which our formularies are taken to express. It can only affect the incriminated person. I cannot see, that it matters who try such questions, so long as they be competent; and the presumption is that Lawyers, guided by trained theologians, are likely to be the most competent. The Law Courts do not make the faith of the English Church. They only interpret those articles of faith, which have been accepted, both by Church and State, as the legal expression of it. So far as I can understand, the Reformers were commissioned to draw up articles of belief and discipline: those articles, having the approval of the Church, expressed through its lawful representatives, were accepted by the Crown as the official statement of the Anglican creed and practice. That statement was made the working basis of the contract between the Church and State. I cannot see, that

the Law Courts have ever tried to go behind, or outside, that basis of agreement. The position of the Scotch Kirk is, I believe, analogous. The Reformers drew up their articles, and they were accepted by the Estates. The General Assembly now cannot, on its own authority, go behind those Acts of Parliament by which the Confession of Faith was made legal. It cannot, without the Royal assent, alter the Westminster Confession. It cannot go behind those Acts, by which the Books of Discipline and Order were approved. It could not, I believe, on its own authority, make the least alteration in the manner of administering the Lord's Supper. It is impossible to see, how there can be any Establishment of religion on any other terms, except those of a legal contract, equally binding on both sides. Over and above the question of Establishment, is the question of Royal Supremacy. There cannot be two Sovereign Powers in one State; and only the Sovereign Power can

have the last word, the final settlement of all causes and appeals; as it has in Scotland, in spite of Lord Halifax. If the Sovereign Power be Ecclesiastical, you have a Papacy, in some form or other. It does not matter whether it reside in one person at Rome, or in a Bench at Lambeth, or in an Assembly at Edinburgh, the principle is the same. The difference in result is only a matter of degree, not of kind. If the Civil Power is to be Sovereign within its own dominions, you must have, in some form or other, the Royal Supremacy. There can be no divided Sovereignty in a single State. There is no escape from one alternative, or the other; and no compromise is possible between them. The fallacy lies, I think, in asserting that an Ecclesiastical Power is necessarily Spiritual; and in assuming that the Civil Power, as exercised through the Royal Supremacy, is exclusive, and not inclusive, of the Church. Surely, the Royal Supremacy, the legal and personified Sovereignty of

the nation, includes the Church, both laity and clergy, in the highest and fullest meaning of the word. If not, the Church must be so alienated from the nation, or so inconsiderable a part of it, that it has no right to be Established. We have not, I think, come to that, as yet: indeed, we are probably farther from it, than we were half a century ago.

Another fallacy, as I think, is to argue from the necessary conditions of an Established Church, to an abstract condition of Christianity itself, which ignores human obligations and engagements. It is urged sometimes, for instance, 'how can you defend the removal of a clergyman, appointed by his bishop, at the orders of a lay court?' 'Does not this subject the gospel and commission of Christ to lay control?' The use of the term 'lay,' I think, begs the real question; but it is forgotten by such reasoners, that the clergyman only came into his position by accepting the Law that created it, and

which he thereby pledged himself to obey. The living itself, that is his exercise of his ministry in that place, exists and is endowed by Law. The Patron who presented, the bishop who instituted him, only have those powers of disposal by Law. He himself only received his spiritual commission on the understanding that he should exercise it in that place, and in the manner prescribed by Law. A man cannot have the advantages and responsibilities of such a position, and also act as though he had a roving commission to preach the gospel to every creature, according to his own fancy and interpretation. He must choose between the two states; and those, who argue thus, must also choose which sort of Christianity and Church they mean to defend. To argue from one to the other is clearly inadmissible in logic. The moment any question of belief passes out of the region of thought, and takes effect in words or actions, it is cognizable by Law; if they be only the

words or actions of a single person. Much more is this true if the words and actions be those of several persons, or of an organized body, a corporation. If such a corporation accept a legal state with its advantages and responsibilities, it must fulfil the terms of its agreement, or terminate the contract. Lord Halifax quotes with approval a wrong and foolish saying of Keble, that Churchmen, who are dissatisfied, should treat decisions they don't like 'as Dissenters treated certain Acts of Parliament, *i.e.* to disregard them, and to take the consequences.' It is open, of course, to any of us, to behave thus to the Laws; but, the Dissenters in question had not accepted legal positions and emoluments, on condition that they obeyed the Law. Keble's analogy, therefore, does not hold good, unless a dissatisfied English clergyman put himself precisely in the position of a Dissenter; and then he would find, that the Law is not so much concerned with his proceedings. This only proves again,

that the Law, the Royal Supremacy, does not interfere with the Christian religion, in the abstract. It must interfere with any organization or expression of it, which enters into legal engagements. The difficulty is not created by the Royal Supremacy. It is not removed, it is not really altered, by an Ecclesiastical Supremacy. It is inherent in our semi-spiritual and semi-material nature. The difficulty is in the nature of things; and we cannot escape from it. The utmost we can do is, to avoid fallacies, and to refrain from that most un-Christian and most un-English habit of applying logic to practical affairs; and forcing logical, or illogical, premisses to extreme conclusions. Only the Church invisible can be free from State control, and human limitations. In no other Church can there be a purely Spiritual Supremacy.

The false analogy of Keble is based on a much more serious error, which Lord Halifax adopts. Keble argues, that the Royal Supremacy was at one time a

personal prerogative; but that now it is 'in commission,' and is exercised by a majority of the House of Commons; and that therefore the clergy are not pledged to obedience. The first premiss is decidedly open to debate; and the facts, as I think, are altogether against Keble's assumption. But, granting the statement were true, could it be argued seriously, that a 'godly prince,' such as James II., a Papist; or William III., a Calvinist; or George I., a Lutheran; or a person like George IV.; is more anomalous as exercising a Supremacy over the English Church, than a Cabinet is, which represents the majority of a mixed House of Commons? Surely, there are more checks and securities for the proper exercise of those functions in the latter case, than in the former. But Keble's reasoning here is only one, of a long series of fallacies, which Lord Halifax has put forward in his Letter to the Bishop of Winchester. They culminate in his verdict, that the Sovereign

should only be Head of the Church when his power is personal and arbitrary, not when it is constitutional and popular. In other words, such a Church, as Lord Halifax desires, is incompatible with Parliamentary Government. Or, putting it in another way, to be a churchman according to the model of Lord Halifax, you must repudiate the whole course of English history since 1688, or 1642. It was in this temper that Innocent III. condemned Magna Charta, and Pius IX. wrote the Syllabus. As men of this temper are not at home under the English Constitution, so they are not properly at home in the English Church. The whole evidence of history shows, that a clergy imbued with such notions is not fit to be trusted with independent power. They had independent power in England, between Henry II. and Henry VIII., when, fortunately, they were superseded. Their 'Catholicism,' whether in its Roman or in its mediæval sense, is always destructive to nations, to Churches, and in the end

to individuals. It is the worst enemy to true religion; and, I believe, it is contradictory to, and exclusive of, New Testament Christianity. I have tried to show how worthless the mediæval and Roman foundations of this spurious 'Catholicism' are. I hope to show that true Catholicism, as we receive and understand it from the Creeds, is something very different. The history of the middle ages illustrates the mischiefs of this false 'Catholicism.' The English history of the same period shows our revolt against that spurious Catholicity; and our wisdom in hating it, both in the interests of Christianity and of the State. In all times, as Lord Halifax reminds us, it has been the ally of arbitrary and lawless methods. From the days of Magna Charta, through the troubles of Henry III. and Charles I., to the apostasy of James II., it has been opposed to the development of our Constitution in Church and State. Lord Halifax' position, as stated by himself, in his extraordinary Letter to the

Bishop of Winchester, is based on a misreading, as I think, of the Statute of Appeals. On page 5, section 2, he quotes that Statute. The phrase in it, 'That part of the body politick called the Spiritualty' means clearly, I think, the English clergy considered (1) as an Estate of the Realm; and (2) in their mediæval aspect, not as the clergy of a free Church, but as a recognized branch of the Latin Patriarchate, subject to the Patriarch. The remarkable phrase, which follows, 'now usually called the English Church,' draws attention, I think, to their new position. It means that the English clergy certainly, but perhaps the whole body of English Churchmen, have become once more a free, self-governing, and Sovereign corporation: *i.e.* with regard to the Roman Church, and all other Churches. The assertion that the English Church is 'sufficient, and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons,' must refer exclusively to the Pope and his officials. The Statute

clearly does not intend by the term 'exterior' to distinguish between the English clergy, and the English laity; between the ecclesiastical and Royal jurisdictions. If it did, the Statute would be contradictory; and its maker, Parliament, would be stultified by its own words and acts. It would be setting up an authority against itself; and, while risking the national existence, by vindicating the Royal Supremacy, as against the Pope, it would be abrogating that Supremacy before the English episcopate. The supposition is ludicrous. It is also contradicted by all the Acts and procedure of the Reformation settlement.

On the other hand, Article XXXVII. is very clear about what it does not understand by the Royal Supremacy. 'We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's word, or of the Sacraments; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God

Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or Temporal.' We find again the careful avoidance of the word Spiritual; which, I notice, is used invariably, instead of ecclesiastical, by the so-called 'Catholic' partizans, who thus beg the whole question in dispute, and then argue from their usurped position. The 'Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures' must connote Manasseh and Zedekiah, as well as Hezekiah. In later times, I suppose, it applies to Herod, advised by the Sanhedrin. These, too, as we know, sat in the seat of Moses, exercising the Supremacy by 'commission,' and yet they were to be obeyed.

Such, then, was the Royal Supremacy as defined and exercised under Queen Elizabeth, to whom our Church and State can not ever be too grateful. She guided us through the most serious of all our dangers. The mediæval Papacy was a cruel and cunning enemy; but the new

Romanism, devised by the Jesuits, at Trent, and propagated by their peculiar methods afterwards, was more cruel, more crafty, far more active, and if possible more unscrupulous and criminal. Its methods, as against its enemies, may be seen in the histories of England, Germany, and Holland. Its more fatal effects, on its friends, are displayed in the martyrdom of Italy, and the murdering of Spain. The attacks of the Jesuits on learning may be studied in the lives of Scaliger and Casaubon. Their dealings with truth are equally exposed in their own writings, and in Pascal's 'Letters.' The effects of their moral and political guidance are shown first in the Court and Society of Louis XV., and then in the Revolution.

It is often asserted, and is believed too easily, that the sixteenth century in England was a time of much distress, and that religion was almost destroyed out of the Kingdom. The vigour and earnestness of all parties, Puritan, Episcopalian, Pres-

byterian, in the seventeenth century, prove that religion could not have been dead in the England of Elizabeth. No one, who knows anything of the facts, would venture to compare the state of religion in England in the sixteenth century, with the state of the two centuries before. It would be impossible to write a decent and a true account of church life, from Edward III. to Richard III., without disguising the narrative in Latin notes, after Gibbon's manner, when he discusses the bad Emperors. The sixteenth century was a time of social and economic change, besides all the restorations in our creed and Church. No country could go through the dangers and revolutions of King Henry's reign, the anarchy of Edward VI., and the pandemonium of Mary, without much distress. In the latter part of Elizabeth, England was more prosperous than it had ever been since the Black Death. It is often said, too; Cardinal Manning was fond of saying it;

that England was robbed of its faith by an unscrupulous minority. We may say at once, that its faith was never the new Romanism of Trent, and still less was it that Vaticanism, which the Cardinal did so much to inaugurate. Henry VIII. had no revenue, and no army, by which he could over-awe his people, or be independent of them. Without popular support, he could not have tamed the clergy, expelled the Pope, and suppressed his Monks. I have shown how and why the Secular clergy would not raise a finger to help the Regulars; but, in deposing them, Henry had with him the whole South of England. The North, or parts of it, two centuries behind the South, was not injured nor depressed by the great wool growers of Rievaulx and Fountains, or by the mitred lords of Furness; as the Southern farmers and burghers were by the Monks of Glastonbury or St. Albans. It was entirely a matter of interest, not of sentiment, in either case. When the North rose to

defend their monasteries, the South enabled the King to put down the rising. London and the South-eastern counties were always for Reform. As before, under Henry III., and later, under Charles I., so under the Tudors the same parts of England were progressive and reactionary. The intelligent South-east was for liberty and progress. The ruder North and the wilder West were for prerogative in Church and State. If it be true, that London and the Eastern counties robbed England of its Civil Liberties in the seventeenth century, then it is equally true to say that they robbed England of its Religious Liberties in the sixteenth.

The intelligent and large minority secured the Civil and Religious Liberties of the whole nation. The great service of Elizabeth was, that she insisted on healing measures; and on giving a fair chance to the greatest of all healers, Time, while her People were learning, through their own experience, and by the horrid spectacle of

their neighbours, to judge between the Reformation and the Reaction. She had ruled by trusting her People, and by proving that she deserved their trust. Before she died, her statesmanship was understood, justified, and accepted by an overwhelming majority; and we, looking back, and making due allowance for Elizabeth's time and circumstances, must join them in praising the greatest of all our Rulers. It was not she, nor her father, who robbed England of its faith; but that insidious Power, which corrupted the mediæval Church, and attacked every mediæval State.

When Elizabeth went to her reward, there followed an alternating policy of panic and repression. The Civil Power tried to crush its enemies by ecclesiastical weapons; and Laud made himself a tool of the King and Strafford for that purpose. He also tried to revive many of the bad mediæval practices, both in worship and in the procedure of the church Courts. It

would be difficult to say whether his follies in England or in Scotland were greater. At any rate, he managed to alienate both kingdoms from the throne, and to unite all the Presbyterian zeal in both Churches. When the retribution came, the bishops were swept away, before the Monarchy itself was seriously attacked. The English Presbyterians, most of whom were Royalists, carried everything before them, and took possession of the Church. They allied themselves with the Scotch, took the Covenant, and tried to impose it, with the Geneva discipline, on the whole country. The discipline they would have set up was far more inquisitorial and arbitrary than the rule of the bishops and the Star Chamber. As Milton says: 'New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large.' Milton's plea for unlicensed printing was urged against the Presbyterian authorities.

Fortunately, Milton's friends prevailed. The Independents broke the Presbyterians, and applied their own remedies in Church

and State. In politics, the victory of Cromwell gave us for the only time in our history an undisguised personal despotism, resting on the sword. Parliaments were packed, or abolished, at the Protector's will. His basis of government was the military district. His instrument was the Major-General commanding it. Taxation was arbitrary. Cromwell protected the liberties of England by shutting them into a military chest, and pocketing the key. Everything, that had been complained of in King Charles, was committed in a more aggravated way by Cromwell, and on a larger scale. The Revolution, which had begun with the Petition of Right and the Grand Remonstrance, had ended in a dead failure, or in a deadlock. In the Cromwellian Church there was the same strange mixture of tyranny and anarchy. Cromwell was a very great and typical Englishman, who meant honestly, but had got into an impossible position. He dared not assume the name of king, because of his

own army. Without that name, the whole machinery of government and Law had lost its motive power and cohesion. Neither in the Church nor in the State could Cromwell rule constitutionally, or come to any settlement. He was willing to establish any, and almost every, form of non-prelatical religion. He re-established a House of Lords. He conquered Scotland, and dealt even more severely with the Irish. His foreign policy was vigorous; though the effect of it was to extend France both on the north and east. He was used by Mazarin; and, but for that Cardinal, he must have threatened the Duke of Savoy with empty words about the Vaudois persecutions. He was fortunate in his death; because not only was his own position untenable, but his finances were not equal to his vigour in diplomacy. In not a single political or ecclesiastical question would he have been in sympathy with those politicians and parties who have lately claimed him for their Patron; and

he would have had more contempt for their methods, than even for their principles. The dead failure of the Puritans in politics and religion led to that re-action which is known as the Restoration. Charles II. was far more powerful than Charles I. had ever been, and when he died after a reign of twenty-five years he was much more arbitrary. The crimes and blunders of his successor brought things to a head, and the Revolution had to be done again. The men who secured our Civil and Religious Liberties were, not the Presbyterians, nor the Independents, but the great Whig statesmen of 1688; though, in the long battle for religious toleration, the chief honours of the victory are due to the passive and Christian resistance made by the Society of Friends.

The first stand against the tyranny of James II. was made by an Oxford College; and the whole country rallied round the Church, in the persons of those seven bishops who were imprisoned for refusing

to break the Law. The Revolution of 1688 was the complement of the Reformation; and, we must remember, it was opposed by the same enemies. Louis XIV. attacked our Revolution, as Philip II. had attacked the Reformation. In both cases, the attack was directed by the same influences, and a defeat would have led to the same results. As we owe the first victory to Queen Elizabeth, so we owe the second to the policy of William III., and the sword of Marlborough.

In that long warfare, caused chiefly by the crimes or blunders of the Stuart kings, much was done, on every side, that is to be regretted; much, that can only be forgotten by putting our common Christianity above party and sectarian bitterness. In spite of warfare, good work was done, and good lives were led. Hooker remains the ideal of what a controversialist should be. He cannot be appreciated without some knowledge of the scurrility and ignorance of his opponents. Bishop Andrewes is the

type of a perfect Anglican. Herbert is a model Parish Priest. Both of them were learned, accomplished, and pious, in the best meaning of the words. Among Dissenters we have Bunyan and Baxter, to take no other names. From 1660 to 1714 is perhaps the golden age of the English Church, as it was the Augustan age of English Letters. The detractors of Charles II. may explain it how they choose; but the one department of State, which King Charles managed for himself, was the Church. In the others, as he pointed out, his words may have been his own, but his acts were his Ministers'. As Johnson observed, 'Charles the Second always had a reverence for what was good. He knew his people, and rewarded merit.' His bishops were the protectors of the nation against James II., and are the glory of the Church. In the Divines and Preachers of that age, we can see what the tradition of sound learning meant. In such men as Walton, and those whom he describes, we can see

the tradition and practice of sound living. Before any one forms a judgment about the close of the seventeenth century and the opening of the eighteenth, I would urge him to put all our popular historians on one side, and make a study for himself, in contemporary authors, of men and movements in the English Church from the Restoration to the death of Anne.

Through all these changes, the outward continuity, the corporate existence, of the English Church had remained unbroken, from the days of Archbishop Theodore, in the seventh century. It is as idle to dispute the continuity of the English Church, as of an Oxford College, or of the Corporation of London. I should maintain for it, too, a continuity of essential doctrine. It has the same Scriptures, and uses the same creeds, which it received at the beginning. Its people receive the same Sacraments, through the same Ministry. In outward form, and in unessential beliefs, it has gone through many changes, some

willingly, some unwillingly; but so has every other national Church in the West of Europe, and most of all the Roman. The Vaticanism of to-day was not the faith of Constance. The feudal Papacy of Boniface VIII. was not the Patriarchate of Gregory I., and even less of Damasus or Liberius. The creed of Pius IV. is not the creed of Nice. The Trans-substantiation of Innocent III. was not the faith of Chrysostom and Basil. Beside such changes of front, as some of these, the changes of the Reformation are trifling; but it would be absurd to argue, that such changes must destroy the continuity of a Church. That depends on corporate life, and essential beliefs. In spite of mediæval ignorance and corruption, the essential beliefs of the Western Church were preserved through the middle ages. It is in these, and not in corrupt excrescences, that continuity is to be found. In any thing, outside the barest elements of Christian life and belief, the mediæval Church

cannot be of the least authority. But, putting the mediæval Church on one side, Lord Halifax, in another reckless Letter, denies any continuous tradition in the English Church since the Reformation. In the reign of Elizabeth, he says, its doctrine 'was almost entirely obscured by Calvinism.' Again, of the eighteenth century, he says, 'Deism seemed well-nigh to have supplanted Christianity.' If Lord Halifax really thinks like this, he cannot know his history. He seems to forget, that, if his theory were true, it would mean the destruction of his own party and their position; while it could make no difference at all to those who take a broader view of the Church and of Christianity. I should have thought a study of Elizabeth's reign would prove how zealously and successfully the Church fought then, both against Popish and Sectarian innovations, and most of all against those of Calvin. Surely there is a consistent Anglican 'tradition,' not only to be found unmistakably in the

formularies of the Church; but to be seen in a certain mode of worship, in a certain stamp of man produced by it. We have departed too commonly, no doubt, of late years, from that fine standard of men and manners; but I think it may be traced, continuously enough, from Hooker to Dr. Routh of Magdalen. It has been imperilled by the excitement and excesses of the Oxford Movement. It is one of Newman's worst fallacies, to appeal from the English Church of the eighteenth century, or of the early nineteenth, to the Latin Church of the eleventh or twelfth, with its 'sweep and swing,' as he phrases it. There is, of course, no useful or fair comparison to be made. The true appeal would be from the English Church of George the Second and Third, to the French Church of Louis XV., and the Italian Churchmen of the same period. I don't think, that, either in zeal or morals, whether clerical or lay, the English Church would come off worst.

After the accession of George I. the

Church was undisturbed by any political affairs. In theology, it had entered upon a long warfare with the Deists, who were driven out of all their positions by Bishop Butler. The Anglican tradition of sound learning was maintained. Among many names, we can only mention Louth, Berkeley, Waterland, and Bentley; though no one who cares for pure English, pure reason, and pure living, can ever omit the name of William Law. It is to the loss of such men as Law from the active ministry of the Church, through their scruples about excluding the Stuart family, that some writers attribute the deadness or lethargy of the Church in the eighteenth century. But a similar deadness, or something worse, overtook every national Church in Europe during the same period; so that the explanation is not adequate. The only activity shown was by a few Pietists in Germany and France, and by Wesley and his followers in England. Their efforts led to what is called the Evangelical Movement

or revival; and that was followed by the Tractarian or Oxford Movement of our own times.

These two movements or parties suggest the two hideous party cries of 'Low' and 'High' Church, which are probably used more often than they are understood; and which never should be used at all by any one who wishes to respect himself, the Church, or the Christian name. Low Church or Evangelical opinions, as I understand the terms, mean a dwelling almost exclusively upon the relation of the individual Christian to Christ. They imply strong, though sometimes indefinite, notions of redemption and of grace. So strongly are these held, that belief in the Sacraments is weakened, and sometimes destroyed. Christianity is considered almost solely as a matter of personal religion. These opinions tend necessarily to impair the value and the activity of the Church, as an organization. They also tend, to a very large extent, to impair or warp the

historical sense of Christianity; and they too often imply a narrow and unscholarly interpretation or use of Scripture. They seem to fill their adherents with an incurable jealousy of other views, and to agitate them with perpetual fears. They are derived usually, and for the most part, from certain words or passages in Saint Paul, to the exclusion of all other passages. Every author has the right to be considered as a whole, and a balance must be struck between all the parts or statements in his work. No doubt Saint Paul says everything, which the Evangelicals attribute to him, though they do not always grasp his meaning, or his context; and he also says a great deal, which they usually omit. Moreover, they often, as I think, apply, to individuals, words and passages which Saint Paul applies clearly to whole bodies of men looked at collectively, and to states or conditions of collective men, rather than to individual opinions. In addition, Evangelical theologians often

think they are reading Saint Paul for themselves, when they are only reading him through the spectacles of Luther or of Calvin. They read into him the pernicious controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries on Grace, and attribute to his words meanings of which he was innocent, and which the original Greek will not bear. The other side are just as uncritical in attributing late meanings to words which refer to the Church and her Ministers, or to the Sacraments. The High Church party think very much of these. Their tendency is to make too little of personal religion, to make the Church of primary instead of secondary importance, by interposing the Church between the individual and Christ; though of course the Church, the whole mystical body, is in some senses of more importance than any single member of it. High Church views, too, in their excess, tend to a Sacerdotalism, which above all other things is anti-Christian, and destructive to true religion.

Unless High Church beliefs are kept alive by a fervent personal religion, they tend as well to formalism, and Pharisaism. What they led to in their defects, when combined with Sacerdotalism, we can see in the condition of Europe before the Reformation, and we can see it still in several European countries. Not that Pharisaism is a monopoly of High Church beliefs. If Sacraments can be misused, so can the Bible. Texts, and 'experiences,' and cant phrases, can be, and have been, used just as Pharisaically and falsely as rites and ordinances have been used. If the Church of Rome have erred by venturing to explain the mode of Christ's presence and operations in the Eucharist, some of the Reformed Churches have erred no less grievously in trying to explain the application of Christ's merits, and the operations of Divine Grace. Both sides have forgotten that 'the Spirit bloweth where it listeth,' and we are warned expressly that we 'cannot tell' whence nor

how. Forgetting these words, men have taken upon themselves to tell us, with disastrous results. Few things, except certain accounts of our redemption, are so repulsive as most treatises on Grace. In describing these matters, extreme Evangelical theologians have gone just as far beyond the words of Scripture, and have done as much violence to them, as the most extreme Sacerdotalists have done in discoursing of the Sacraments. The only difference that I can see between the schoolmen and some of the Reformed theologians is, that the former knew more logic. Both are equally far from Christianity and Scripture, and equally ignorant of the words and things they venture to discuss. We shall have neither unity nor truth until most of the Reformed Theology has been swept away into the same Limbo as the disputes of the schoolmen. What Erasmus thought of them can be seen in his 'Praise of Folly.' He would have held much the same opinions about some Re-

formed Theologians, and about most of our present quarrels. 'Such studies,' as Wesley's mother said to him, 'tend more to confound than to inform the understanding.' Such opinions, too, as those of Calvin, lead only too often to Fatalism or to Antinomianism, two errors which are both latent in 'Evangelical' Theology.

It is here that we see at once how far Saint Paul himself was removed from the excesses of his pretended followers. No one is stronger against Antinomianism, nor is it possible for any one to give a 'higher' view of the Church than he gives in two of his Epistles. Saint Paul never forgot that, in one sense, Christianity was a personal relation between Christ and each Christian. Christ was to him an ever-present Saviour and Master. Indeed, He is more: He is an inward living principle of thought and action. This great truth of the Christ abiding in each believer is taught by no modern so finely as by William Law; and it is one of the surest solvents for crude

'Evangelical' views of the redemption, and of Grace, as well as for material notions of the Sacraments.

Views about the Sacraments, or about Grace, have been the most frequent causes of dispute in the Church, and of separation from it. Such disputes have been aggravated because the modes or operations of divine Grace have not been revealed to us by Scripture, and therefore cannot possibly be explained by theology. Theologians have neither known what they were talking about, nor have understood the terms they used. It is only natural that they should have misunderstood one another, and that their followers should have added to the confusion.

The Church of England, at her Reformation, retained the two Sacraments instituted by Christ, 'as generally necessary.' She also remembered the 'high' mystical views of the Church that are given by Saint Paul, and all those descriptions of the 'Kingdom' which Christ himself has

made. Guided by these, and by what she found in the Apostolic writings, she prescribed the offices and duties of her Ministers. She condemned and abhorred Sacerdotalism, but she did not therefore go on to deny that there was a true Christian Priesthood, to administer God's Word and Sacraments. By thus coupling the two duties together, she showed that she meant a Ministerial Priesthood, such as is described in all the ancient liturgies, and not such a Priesthood as had led, and leads still, to the abuses of Clericalism. The Church saw that some of Saint Paul's teaching had been overlaid by the corruptions of the Middle Ages, and she pointed out that there were means of Grace outside the Sacraments, that there was access to God without ministerial assistance, and that religion was a personal, not a ritual, affair. But, in so doing, she never denied the reality and necessity of the Sacraments, nor the prophetical office of the Church. Like Saint Paul, she held the whole body of truth

in perfect balance, observing the proportion of faith.

Our High Church Party for a long while observed the distinction between what was Catholic, and what was Roman, repudiating the latter. Of late years, some of them have adopted quite modern Roman practices, and by so doing have stultified their own position, as well as the historical attitude taken by their Church in the Sixteenth Century. More than this, other High Churchmen have apparently gone on to argue, that everything 'Catholic' is right, and therefore lawful. There is no more fatal error. So-called 'Catholic' beliefs and practices, like everything else, must be referred to Scripture. If they cannot meet that test they are not binding, or may even be wrong. This school of Churchmen often forget, that our Creed speaks not merely of the Catholic, but of the Apostolic, Church. The only Apostolic Church, of which we are certain, is to be found in the Epistles and the Acts. The final appeal is

not, as some persons are asserting now, to the Sixteenth Century, with all its prejudice and passion; nor, as the other side retort, is it to the Middle Ages, with all their insolence and ignorance. The only valid appeal, in the last resort, is to the Primitive Church of the Apostolic writings, interpreting them by the most precise contemporary and exterior knowledge we can attain, construing them by the strictest rules of grammar, and testing our conclusions by all that we can find applicable in the writings or practice of the united Church. By such an appeal the Church of England must stand or fall. I believe she will answer to it more truly and fully than any other Church, or than any sect.

Both High Church and Low Church views are to be found in Saint Paul; but in that perfect balance, which is what we mean by good, or sound, or reasonable Churchmanship. We can imagine what Saint Paul would have said to those, who extracted pieces out of his letters, and used

them for party cries and factions. This is precisely what has been done since the Reformation, and what causes our present troubles. Both sides are partly right and partly wrong, because the whole truth is with neither of them. They differ, as a rule, only about words, or modes of expression, not about the truths which underlie them; and they make much of these differences of detail, instead of making much more of realities, in which I know they are far more agreed than they imagine. Within the limits of the Prayer Book, according to the letter of the Law, the widest differences of detail should be allowed. But, everything contradictory to the Law, and to the first principles of the English Church, as, for instance, Romanizing by teaching Trans-substantiation, by making rules about fasting before Communion, by forcing or influencing children to confess, should be dealt with as sternly as Queen Elizabeth dealt with her Puritans; and by the same precedent, by punishing

organized and aggressive action with unflinching rigour.

At the end of our long investigation, it may, perhaps, be useful to recapitulate some of the positions we have secured. We have traced the outward forms and fortunes of Christianity, from its earliest organizations in Syria and Greece. We are not told how or when Christianity was brought into Rome; but we are told, that the Christian Church already there was visited and strengthened by Saint Paul. When the Capital was gained, Christianity soon went into all the Provinces. We have, again, no certain knowledge of how or when Christianity was brought into Celtic Britain; but we know there was an early British Church, embracing the whole island. This was destroyed, or driven out of the South-eastern parts, by our heathen English forefathers; and they, in turn, were made Christians by the labours of Celtic, French, and Italian missionaries. The various elements of Christianity in

South Britain, or England, were united and organized into one Church by the year 668. Since then there has been a National Church of the whole English People. It has gone through many vicissitudes. It has been corrupted and reformed. It has suffered, and inflicted, many wrongs; but there are two things it has never done. It has never failed in its visible and corporate existence; and, in spite of errors and reforms, of worldliness and torpor, in spite of mistakes in judgment and even in temper, it has never changed its essential beliefs. It holds the faith once for all delivered to the Saints, and expresses it in those ancient Creeds, which it received from the beginning. It has always dispensed the Word and the Sacraments by Ministers duly authorized in the ancient way, using the titles and offices found in Scripture. These are matters of historical fact, and not merely of theological dispute or speculation. The English Church is as evident and unmistakable in history as

the English People. I have now, on the one hand, shown its historical connexion with those countries and Churches from which it received its Christianity; and, on the other hand, I have tried to show something of its internal history. Whether we believe or not in that which is known technically as the Apostolical Succession, we must hold that between the Apostolic Churches of the New Testament, and the present Church of England, there has been an unbroken succession of believers, holding essentially the same belief, and organized in essentially the same visible and external way. If there be a divinely organized and visible Church of Christ, to which allegiance is due, the Church of England is the representative of it among the English People. This is what I mean by her 'Position,' historically; and this once established, her theological 'Message' follows as a necessary consequence.

How to interpret that Message is another question, and is the cause of all

our present disputes in belief and worship; but to abandon large truths, or to despair of them, because their details, or the modes of expressing them, are in dispute, seems to me no less criminal than foolish. Nearly all disputes are caused by a mis-use of terms. They are usually verbal, not real. I have touched on the wicked party cries of 'Low' and 'High' Church, and their mis-use. The terms 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' are just as often mis-used, or not understood. 'Protestant' is usually made to cover every sort of non-Conformist or Evangelical opinion, and is usually confined to those opinions. In its first and proper meaning, the term 'Protestant' was applied to those who protested for the supreme and final authority of the Bible, and against the usurped authority of Rome. It is, therefore, a positive and not a negative appellation. In its proper meaning, it belongs to the 'highest' Anglican, if he be loyal, as well as to all the Orthodox Eastern Churches. The term 'Catholic'

in its proper sense, means nothing but 'universal,' though always with an implication that what is universal must likewise be old, or it cannot be of grave authority. It means really something Primitive and Apostolic, something Scriptural. In this sense, every so-called 'Protestant' or 'Low Church' doctrine, which can be extracted out of Saint Paul, is necessarily 'Catholic.' This sense is usually forgotten by those who arrogate the name to themselves, and use it with a wholly perverted meaning. Such persons are very loud and troublesome at present. They confuse the term 'Catholic' with the term 'mediæval'; forgetting, apparently, that all the Western Churches of the middle ages must be ruled out of court, simply on the score of ignorance. They had neither the learning, nor the capacity, nor we may add the temper, to decide any question of belief or practice. Their decisions cannot be of the least weight, theologically speaking. Yet the English Church Union, for instance,

confines the term 'Catholic,' apparently, to those mediæval practices and notions, and in the name of a phantom 'Catholic Church' is prepared to challenge the Acts of Uniformity, the Royal Supremacy, and to violate the Law. The faith once for all delivered is clearly not derived from any Court of Law. So far as I can see, no Court has ever even discussed it, and much less tried to alter it. The utmost the Courts have done is to decide whether the thoughts or fancies of individuals, about the faith, are legal; and whether certain practices are forbidden or allowed. As to the first, it cannot matter, except to the individuals accused, what the Courts may hold. As to the second, the Courts for the sake of order should certainly be obeyed. If our 'Catholics' would look behind the middle ages, and take the trouble to learn something about antiquity, they would find that incense, lights, and vestments, for example, though ancient, are not Primitive, and are certainly not Apostolic nor Scriptural.

They are not, therefore, essential to the beliefs which they are supposed to symbolize; and the same thing may be said of private confession, of fasting communion, and of every single Romanizing and Ritualistic practice, for which these men are now disturbing the peace of the Church, and threatening to defy the Laws of the Church and Realm. It is not left us to imagine what the Apostles would have said to them on both accounts. I fail utterly to see that certain important beliefs, such as the real presence in the Eucharist, can depend now, as they did not depend at the first, upon the use of lights and incense, or the wearing of certain clothes. But I do feel very strongly, that a person going into an English Church ought to be sure beforehand that he will not be present at a foreign or an obsolete ritual, or at a meeting of Bible Christians. He should find something between the two. There is a certain right and reasonable standard of Anglican worship, to be found in its perfection at

our Cathedrals and in some of our College Chapels at Cambridge and Oxford. That standard should not be exceeded, and should as far as possible be reached, or aimed at. From the restoration of the Church in 1660, until a few years ago, that decent and comely service might be found in every church and chapel where the niceties of worship were cared for, with hardly the smallest variation in details. Variations depended more on the resources of any given church than upon doctrinal reasons. The large body of the laity, and I hope a larger majority among the clergy, have a just grievance because they are failing more and more to find it. It is such a standard as should satisfy ritualistic and æsthetic taste, and yet should not offend or distract the austerest Puritan. That is precisely the broad and reasonable moderation of belief and practice at which our Reformers aimed. It is entirely in the spirit of the English Church, and it is what the majority of the English People have

always desired. They read history in vain, who think the English People admire Puritan defects in worship, or desire a return to mediæval practices. Certainly they have studied theology in vain, who think that mediæval practices and beliefs are 'Catholic.'

Behind ritual, however, both Ritualists and Puritans would say, are certain questions affecting the organization and Ministry of the Church, about which opinions are so divided as to be irreconcileable. Such, for instance, are the questions of Orders and the Apostolical Succession. But how little, after all, we, any of us, know about the real meaning of the terms we use so easily, or even about the meanings we attach to them. The Church of Rome herself, which has ventured to explain most things, has never, I think, settled the precise difference between a bishop and a priest. She has never said whether it is a difference in kind, or only in degree. Even the Pope himself, in his

recent letter about English Orders, confesses it is dubious. Does the episcopal power belong to bishops personally; is it an 'Order'? Or did it come to them at first as the representatives of their presbyters, acting as their head, and with their assent? This question is insoluble. Again, do 'Orders' themselves pertain solely to ordained persons, coming down to them through a succession of Ministers; or do they come to them as representing the whole congregation, and acting for them, as a matter of decency and convenience, but still possessing real powers, bequeathed by Christ? These questions again are almost insoluble. There is evidence in the Scriptures, which seems to look both ways. Again, were the promises made to the Apostles, about binding and loosing, about celebrating the Lord's Supper, made to them personally, to be handed on through an ordained Ministry; or were they made through the Apostles, to the whole body of Christians, the 'royal priesthood,' as Saint

Peter calls them; and does the Church virtually convey them to her representatives, through a succession of lawfully appointed Ministers? Again we must say, these questions are insoluble, through long mis-use. What is clear is, that certain promises were made by Christ to his Church, and certain real powers conferred. We seem to see those powers handed on by the Apostles, usually, though not always, to persons chosen by the congregations. We know the names of their offices. We cannot very clearly define or separate their duties, in the narrative of Scripture. But, almost before scripture history ends, and certainly before any definite church history begins, we find certain Ministers, with duties well defined, in the exercise of their functions; and there is no evidence to show that this was an innovation. It would, therefore, be very rash, to say the least of it, in the face of history, in the face of apparently Apostolic practice, and above all, in the face of Christ's mysterious and serious

commission, to abolish such a Ministry. The Church of England accepts it, and continues it, as Primitive; but she makes no assertions about its nature, nor does she assert anything about those, outside herself, who have not taken precisely her own views. She has protested against sacerdotal assumptions and practices. In her own practice, she has been most rigorous about the observance of her forms, and has left us in no doubt as to her own mind and preferences. Nevertheless, it would I think be very difficult, on the evidence of Scripture and Primitive history, to disprove, in a full Catholic sense, the validity of Orders in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. To deny them is quite another thing from disproving them. They are denied easily enough, without any attempt at proof. It is just as easy to deny or to assert about the whole question of 'Orders' and the Ministry. The evidence and our real knowledge being what they are, wise men should be content

to believe the fulness and reality of Christ's promises to his Church, without disputing about the nature of his Sacraments, or the way in which his divine commission is conveyed. Except for the pleasure of wrangling over words, there is very little to dispute about in the 'Apostolical Succession,' unless those who claim it go on to make themselves into a sacerdotal caste.

The dangers, and the undeniable abuses of 'sacerdotalism,' no doubt, with many people, stand in the way of their accepting the literal words and promises of Christ. They read his words at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and his long discourse in the sixth chapter of Saint John; or they read his mysterious words about loosing and binding sin; and they are perplexed by them. They would like to accept them, but they end by explaining them away. To accept them, as they are generally understood, seems to establish at once a sacerdotal caste, and they find so much in the New Testament, in every part of it, and

by every writer, which is not reconcileable with castes and narrow priesthoods. Such persons, too, in the whole course of church history find only too much evidence, that adds to their misgivings. And so Christians are divided by opinions, or principles, which seem to be irreconcileable; and which are not reconcileable, as 'Orders' are generally explained and understood. The question, therefore, arises, have 'Orders' been rightly understood? Is it necessary, that Christians should be thus divided? As we have attained to broader and more scientific views about the term 'Faith,' as used by Saint Paul, and the terms 'Grace,' 'Original Sin,' 'Law,' the 'Vocation' of Jews and Gentiles, so we may come to hold broader and truer views about the endowments of Christ's body mystical, and the functions of its Ministers. It may be, that the Apostles have been regarded too much as standing above the Church, and apart from it; and that promises made, or endowments given, to the whole

mystical body of Christ, have been regarded as made and given solely to the Apostles, and through them to their 'successors,' considered separately and exclusively. It may be, too, that promises made to the Apostles, merely because they were the first disciples, or the only disciples present, have been interpreted, wrongly, as applying to them exclusively, and not inclusively as representing the larger and future Church. Certainly in Saint Paul, the Apostles, when they are mentioned among Christian officers, are always subordinate to the whole body of Christ: they do not stand separate from it, or above it. All functions appear to flow from the body to all its officers and members, not from any officers or Ministers to the body. If we pursue the enquiry into church history, we certainly find in the Liturgies, that the clergy were regarded as a ministerial priesthood, representing the congregation, speaking in their name, speaking in the plural number.

They never seem to be regarded as a caste, possessing separate powers or endowments of their own, and using them for the benefit of the congregation: yet this is what the modern sacerdotal theory comes to, both among the Romans and the Ritualists. The solution seems to lie in a larger and truer interpretation of Saint Paul, where he treats of the Church and its Ministry. We know, in the political sphere, how many crude theories, all now untenable, incredible, have been held about the origin of society itself, and of government. The theory of the Social Contract was one of those rude attempts. The Divine Right of Kings was another. The attributes of the Roman Emperors, as explained by Lawyers, was a third. All these, we now perceive to be crude and false; and we account for the origin of society, and the authority of governments in another way. It may be, that our way of explaining the origin and authority of Christian Ministers has been just as crude and blundering. In

attributing the promises made by Christ, and the powers conferred by him, to his whole body, the Church, it does not follow that any member of that body, at his own will, can lawfully exercise those functions. Because we deny the Divine Right of Kings, it does not follow that every Englishman may exercise sovereign or official powers, nor that lawful authorities may be deposed and changed capriciously. The more firmly we believe in the prerogatives of the State, the more firm is the position of its Ministers, and the more certain is their succession and right appointment. So it is also, as I believe, in the Church. It must clearly be untrue that any set of Christian men have special powers, as apart from the whole body mystical of Christ, and coming down to them in a special way through a separate caste. It is nevertheless true, as I think, that certain powers have been handed down from the beginning. They have, no doubt, been grievously mis-used; because, perhaps,

their origin, as well as their nature, has been mis-understood.

The power of absolution, of remitting sin, as understood at present, seems to have departed still further from early usages. In the first place, the conferring of that power, as one of the priestly functions, is comparatively of late origin, if we may judge by the Liturgies. This, of itself, discredits the necessity of private confession and absolution, as practised in the later middle ages. Confession seems at first to have been a public act, made to the congregation. What we now call 'absolution' seems to have been the re-admission of an erring member to the Christian body. It was pronounced by the Minister, speaking in the name of the congregation. It was not spoken in his own name, or by any personal or special power of his own. Out of this, the modern theory and practice has been developed, chiefly through that mediæval ignorance, which has been so mischievous to the whole Western

Church, and by which we are still too commonly dominated and infected. The power of binding and loosing, therefore, the 'power of the keys,' seems to have been an endowment of the Christian Society, to be exercised through its lawful Ministers, acting in its name; but not to be exercised by them, in a private capacity, as a special endowment of themselves, considered as a caste.[1]

Questions about Orders, Sacraments, and Church Discipline have, in the past, been prolific of disputes and separations. In the future, I believe a reconciliation will be found, through some such explanation as I have suggested, between views and claims which have been held too long to be irreconcileable. It will be possible, I think, to accept the words of Christ literally and fully, and to believe in the largest endowments for his Church without incurring the dangers and abuses of sacerdotalism; and without falling into the equally crude errors and defects of those who make the

[1] See note, p. 235.

Ministry nothing but the creatures of their congregations. Because the theory of Divine Right in politics is untrue, it does not follow that anarchy or communism is true. There is a constitutional theory, which attributes the fullest powers and Sovereignty to the State, and conveys the fullest powers to the officers of State; and yet secures the rights, both of such officers, and of those for whom they act. So, I think, *mutatis mutandis*, it will be, some time or other, in the Church; and then, perhaps, high church and low church explanations, so far as both are true, will be reconciled, as they may and should be.

There are those who deny all Sacraments, all Orders, all theology, who ignore church history. One would have thought there was nothing left to quarrel over. Yet a sect of this kind, founded only in 1830, has now fallen into at least six pieces. To go to the New Testament, knowing little or nothing perhaps of its original language, knowing even less of

the times and people described in it; forgetting how very much we really know of the officers and worship of the Synagogues, out of which the first Churches were formed, and of the Greek Clubs or Associations, by which undoubtedly the early converts were much influenced; to misread, or to read only partially, the New Testament itself; and to compose all this mass of ignorance and prejudice into that which is called 'Bible Christianity'; is one of the most unhistorical and irreligious of all possible occupations. I need scarcely point out how popular it has been, and how utterly ineffectual.

Inadequate is, perhaps, the word to use for those who take the separate Congregation as the basis and fullest expression of church life. Their notion, too, was obtained by mis-reading the New Testament, and omitting from it all we are told about Apostolic action, and the authority of the Apostles over whole groups of Churches, linking them together.

Moreover, the Congregational theory seems incompatible with a great deal of Saint Paul, especially with his 'high' and comprehensive notions of the Church in Colossians and Ephesians, as well as with his battle for Christian unity. It is inconceivable that he wrote so definitely, or suffered so much, for an ideal or spiritual Church, which, if it existed in reality at all, existed only in separate and scattered members; or that words of his, for which the whole earth is scarcely big enough, should be applicable only to small and isolated groups of men. The Congregationalists, moreover, by their existing organization stultify either their present position, or their old principles.

Against the notion of the Church being invisible or merely spiritual, for the sake of which so many have left the unity of the Church Visible, we must consider our Lord's parables of 'The Kingdom,' which seem to dispose of all such theories. Besides, such theories, if applied to any real

body of Christians, lead invariably to an inner sect within the sect, which becomes virtually an autocratic and exclusive body, and which after all has no protection against schemers and hypocrites; so that the ideally pure Church is never secured in practice. By such inner or select representatives, the so-called Free Churches are perhaps dominated too much. Neither for laymen, nor for ministers, is there any real freedom in some of these societies. The smaller a church organization is, the narrower, as a rule, are its opinions, and the more autocratic is its temper. One tyrannizing element seems, however, to be now removed. The so-called Free Churches not long ago, issued a Catechism, in the name, I think, of eight different bodies, once separated, but now seeking for a common basis. This desire for unity is one of the most promising and excellent of all movements. These eight bodies, however, seem able to have united only by eliminating Calvin and his theology from

their common manifesto; and, for some of those bodies, Calvin's theology was at one time not only the dominating element, but their very foundation and first principle. The God of Calvin, as Catholic theologians have always said, is not the God of the Bible; and most of Calvin's followers now seem to have reached the same conclusion.

Even in the Kirk of Scotland, I believe, Calvin's doctrines of Predestination are no more a living force; and the Kirk, no doubt, if it had all that freedom, which Lord Halifax imagines for it, would gladly follow the Free Churches, and eliminate Calvin from its Confession; or, at any rate, would modify those terms of subscription, which are imposed at ordination. By these, as I am told, the Kirk is deprived of many earnest and promising candidates for the Ministry.

In arguing from the Kirk to the Church of England, Lord Halifax does not seem to consider an obvious, though perhaps a subtil, difference between them. The Kirk

has a rigid and written constitution, something like that of the United States, which extends to the minutest details of doctrine, of discipline, and of worship. Within these rigid limits, it may, without any danger, have a free exercise of its discretion. Our constitution in the Church is analogous to our constitution in the State. It is flexible, adaptable, and not rigorously defined. It depends on rulings, and usage, and interpretations, more than upon documents. The Sovereign Power has not, therefore, the same security against innovation and aggression by Anglican clergy, which experience proves it has in the case of the Scotch Establishment. Moreover, there is a vast difference of temper or ἦθος between the High Church Anglicans, and the Ministers of the Kirk. Lord Halifax argues, too, that the Elders and other lay officers of the Kirk are made 'spiritual' persons, by the imposition of hands. Does he, then, believe in Presbyterian Orders: or does he maintain that all confirmed

persons with us are also 'spiritual'? Will he likewise, when speaking of the early sixteenth century, extend the term 'spiritualty' to every clergyman, to every tonsured person? That extension would, I think, be true. It seems to me fallacious to argue from our narrow connotation of the term 'clergy,' to the enormous mediæval connotation. If the mediæval, or 'catholic,' fashion were revived, of tonsuring the Lawyers, and extending to them the 'benefit of clergy,' would this very simple expedient satisfy Lord Halifax and his friends with regard to the ecclesiastical courts? On their own principles, and according to their own arguments, it should remove all their difficulties and scruples; and I feel sure the other side would have no objection, nor probably would the Lawyers.

The large historical Churches, with all their faults, have more Christian liberty, than the smaller societies, and certainly more breadth of thought. For our own Church, the Establishment is very whole-

some, because it secures a certain amount of lay interest and control, and restrains the worst excesses of clericalism. It would be still better for us if lay interest and control were largely increased, and made a real influence in church government and work. If that could be brought about, and secured, I believe we should see a large increase of numbers, and an even greater increase of life. For every sacerdotalist, who might be alienated or expelled, I believe we should gain ten more valuable Christians, from among those whose objections to us are no longer doctrinal or constitutional. The one obstacle for such persons is the present Romanizing and sacerdotal tendency. Those, outside the Church, who complain of its Romanizing, should consider very seriously how far they themselves are answerable for it. The exodus of the Wesleyans, against the wishes and orders of their Founder, no doubt removed from the Church a large and zealous body, which would have acted as a

counterpoise to the haste and crudeness of the Tractarian Party. Such a counterpoise would have been equally wholesome for both extremes, and of double value to the whole Church. Those, again, who wish to cure Romanizing by Disestablishment will by that means only give a free hand to persons whom they wish to restrain. Establishment or Disestablishment seems to me secondary and accidental, so far as the Church herself is concerned. It is not secondary with regard to the State. This is the day of big things, especially in politics. Now the Empire is expanding and consolidating, I, for one, do not wish to see the Church contracting or dissolving. I should like to see a national English Church representing the English Peoples as fully as the Empire represents them, and as visibly before the world. It is only so, perhaps, that the Church of Rome can be held in her true place.

What her future is to be, it is difficult to say. Since the Reformation, she has reaffirmed her worst errors and frauds more

positively than ever. At the Council of Trent, she handed her fortunes over to the Jesuits, and they have ruled her ever since. They have led her to the dogma of Papal Infallibility, and may lead her, probably, to define the Temporal Power as an Article of Faith. When Faith once passes from divine persons and things to human persons and politics, it is not easy to say where it will stop. Meanwhile, in all the Latin countries she loses ground, and is an element of danger and disorder in them all, by fishing in troubled waters. In Italy, she has done her utmost to make it impossible for any one to be a good Italian and a good churchman. She has intrigued with any and every form of anarchy, in order if possible to upset, or to impede, a constitutional government. It cannot be pretended, that all this is done for the sake of Christianity; as not a single Christian doctrine is threatened in Italy, except by the continuation of this reckless policy, which must end in bringing forth a popula-

tion alienated not so much from the only form of Christianity known to them, as from Christianity itself. All these dangers are incurred solely for the Temporal Power. How can it be argued seriously, that Leo XIII. is less free under King Humbert's government, than Pius IX. was under Napoleon's bayonets, or Gregory XVI. under the hand of Austria? The Popes never have been free; because they have always had to be defended from their own subjects, or from a rival power in Italy. Before Clement VII., they were never settled nor secure in Rome. After Clement, they were protected by Austria or France; and, under such protection, the Popes were never free agents, nor impartial judges. The Pope is, indeed, a prisoner in the Vatican, but not the prisoner of King Humbert. His gaolers are the Jesuits. It is they, who order and control this reckless policy. Their methods of conducting it are to be detected in their Press. Its effects are to be seen in France and Austria, as

well as in Italy. It is only by studying the clerical Press of Italy and France, that the temper, the methods, and the designs of the Vatican are to be understood. People are deceived by the pious phrases of the Pope, forgetting that they are the conventional and diplomatic outfit of the Holy See; and that, of old time, the most ferocious edicts were garnished, for the sake of appearances, with these traditional phrases. The harmless White Pope may reign over the Vatican, but the Black Pope rules there; and it is with him, that the Roman Congregations, the Bishops, and the diplomatic world, have ultimately to reckon. So disturbing is this power to the Episcopal office, that Cardinal Manning used to describe the Jesuit system as Presbyterianism; and, indeed, the Jesuits, like the mediæval Friars, are a disturbing, almost a dissenting, power intruded into every diocese where they gain a footing.

It would be interesting to know the real numbers of effective Roman Catholics, not

the fictitious numbers, as given by clerical statistics. They reckon all Belgium, when they should reckon half of it; and all France, when they should perhaps reckon about a third; and so on. In the diocese of Southwark, as the Bishop himself confesses, they have decreased since 1895, not relatively to the population, but absolutely, by some thousands; and Dr. Bourne hints that it is the same in Westminster. At any rate, in the Latin countries, Rome is the Church of failing and declining nations, not only in numbers, but in mind. This is the most serious problem she has to face. How far that decline is due to her, should be a profitable subject for her own theologians to discuss. We decided it nearly four centuries ago. The three growing Powers of the world, which seem to have all the future with them, are the British Empire, Russia, and the United States; and in none of them, except perhaps in the last, is the Roman Church worth considering. I doubt, whether, as ruled from Rome at present, or by Italian

men and methods, the Roman Church will continue to hold her own in Australia or the United States. In Australia certainly, as I know by experience, the men educated in Rome, and the methods of Rome, are detested and despised by the great body of the Irish Clergy. The Irish, from the sixteenth century onwards, found in Rome a support against the English Government, of which they naturally made the most. As their own life grows fuller and freer, their poetical and Celtic nature will draw them away from Rome. This, I think, is inevitable, judging both by the past and by the present. In America, it is almost pitiable to see the Pope trying to hold the new wine of democracy and socialism in his old bottles. There have been burstings, and there will be many more. The effervescing submission of the American Bishops is the most evident sign of all, that the process is neither real nor lasting. The English nature and the Roman system are, I believe, irreconcileable, and have always been. The

Syllabus of Pius IX. is a logical process from the condemnation of the Great Charter by Innocent III. The enmity between England and Rome is not merely religious. Religion is only one pretext for enforcing it. It is a repugnance of race and nature, which cannot be got over. As long ago as 1382, in the flood of re-action after the Peasants' War, the Commons, against the King, the Lords, and the Prelates, said 'it was not their will to be tried for heresy; nor to bind themselves and their posterity to the bishops more than their forefathers had in old time'; and they insisted that Crown officers should not work for the bishops. The same temper goes through our history and People, from the Conquest until the Revolution was made secure in 1745. It is now as strong as ever, in a latent way. Given fuel, it will flame out at any time. Unless there is to be a thorough change of nature, on one side or the other, there can be no union with Rome; and no re-union of Christendom for us, on that basis, putting

doctrinal questions altogether on one side.

If the Vatican like to retrace its steps in the direction of Christianity, we might begin to consider the question. If the then Pope have reached the position once held by Gregory I., we might welcome a true Roman Patriarch. We can make no terms, ever, with an Infallible and Sovereign Pontiff. Moreover, to those who know Rome from the inside, her peace and unity are more superficial than real. The old quarrels between Seculars and Regulars still proceed. There is the same old jealousy between the Orders. Clergy and Monks of different nations get on very ill together. There is a perpetual Irish and English feud, especially in the new countries. The general submission of the laity is more from apathy, than from intelligent obedience. They have no interest in theology, and very little in church life. Besides, as we saw lately, over Palestine, the various nations in the Roman Church do not on

that account love one another as they should. The French and German clerical Press, last autumn, could not, or should not, have been more virulent if they had been the organs of rival and hostile sects.

The Roman way is to conceal differences, and to avoid friction. Our English way is to talk out our differences. In the seventeenth century, when Party Government took its present form, foreigners were always saying that the English State must fall to pieces; but yet we are, at any rate, as firm now as the most autocratic of our neighbours. So it is, to some degree, in the Church. Our differences are mostly noise; and those critics make a serious mistake, who judge of us without allowing for the differences of nature and principle between themselves and us. At the same time, we might learn from the Romans not to push differences of detail to the same length as differences of principle. We need not, therefore, imitate them by swallowing our principles. In Parliament, men will stick out

for details, to a certain point, and then agree on broad principles. In Convocation, clergymen will fight on details for years, till not only principles but all principle has been forgotten. If the State were managed so, it could not hold together. The danger is not less for the Church.

By the terms 'Rome' and 'Roman Church,' I mean exclusively the local Church or Court of Rome, the Curia. I do not mean the various national Churches in communion with Rome. They are the dupes, not the accomplices, of the Papacy, and of its modern agents, the Jesuits. I do not wish to reflect upon individuals, who, for the most part, are not responsible for the Roman system, and few of whom even understand it; nor do I mean to speak harshly of the charming semi-paganism of Roman Catholic populations in country places. The misfortune is, that their innocence and their genuine piety are always being exploited by the dominant faction, for its own purposes. I do not

see how 'Rome,' understood in that sense, can be considered a Church at all, properly speaking. The Papacy, the Roman Curia, is nothing but a political organization, which disguises its real purposes under theological and devotional expressions. The Roman apologists, too, though they may not know it, are still affected by the mediæval forgeries. The position gained by these was taken, at the Council of Trent, as the basis of the reconstructed Papacy; although their origin had been exposed, and was admitted. Since then, the Papal attributes and theory have been developed further, by various 'triumphs over history.' So impossible is the case to defend, without manipulation, that no Ultramontane can afford to approach the facts impartially, in a scientific way. He never can be a judge, allowing the facts to speak freely, and merely summing up. He must be an advocate, presenting a case, and arguing a brief. His methods must be deductive. They cannot be inductive. He cannot start

with an open mind, following truth and facts, wherever they may lead. He must start with a preconceived theory, and bend his facts into conformity with it. The result is, that he must contend for victory, not for truth, like the French General Staff at present; and the methods in both cases are not dissimilar. Nor are the intellectual and moral effects dissimilar, on those who stoop to such methods of advocacy.

The Roman Clergy, as a whole, are almost as ignorant of Greek now, as they were before Erasmus; and their Vaticanism has made them even more bitterly opposed, than they were at the Renaissance, both to the methods of Greek thought, and to the masters of Greek theology. The Jesuits, no doubt, are supple enough; but theirs is not the intellectual suppleness exhibited by Plato, it is the immoral suppleness exposed by Pascal. Leaving them, we may return once more to the Greek Church. If Russia become civilized and hold together, her Church

must become civilized with her. We may see a large, learned, and zealous Greek Church again after five centuries of oppression. If so, Rome will find on one flank of herself such a rival as for size, unity, and unanswerable arguments against the Papacy, she has never known. On the other flank, I hope she may find a strong united Church of all the English speaking Peoples, worthy to represent the British Empire and the United States on their spiritual side. This I conceive to be the true Message and Position of the English Church, and her Mission to the world. It can only fail if she be untrue to her Master, or if her children be untrue to their English common sense. Many of our friends outside have thought the English Church had a great mission in the future, as the restorer of Christian unity. She alone, of the historical Churches, seems to unite the early Church with the Churches of the Sixteenth Century. I appeal, therefore, to those within her, who

call themselves 'Catholics,' not to spoil and hinder that gracious Mission by turning away from true Catholicity, and narrowing the term to the thoughts and customs of the ignorant Western Middle Ages. These, as I have tried to show, cannot be of the least authority. The Papal claims are only founded on violated grammar, and wrong philology. In themselves, they are little better than a fairy tale; and the whole mediæval Church, which partly rose out of them, and was partly corrupted by them, is hardly of any more weight and authority than they are themselves. To others, I would say, use patience; give the Church time. She purged herself from the real disease of Popery in the Sixteenth Century. Be sure that she will purge herself from an absurd imitation of it in the Nineteenth. To both Parties, I would say, go back; one of you, behind the Sixteenth Century, the other, behind the Middle Ages. Neither your 'catholicism' nor your Pauline Calvinism

is to be found in any of the earlier centuries. When you have both found what you seek, in the right way and place, you will see there are no differences between you. If there be, the phrase 'I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church' is a fallacy, or a falsehood.

Finally, Christ, our Divine Master, is not a bundle of opinions, nor a set of rites; but a living and ever present human Person. We believe that his Church in the end will triumph. In the past, its intellectual triumph over internal enemies has perhaps been made too much of. In the future, we should work more for its practical and moral triumph. Let us not forget the Apostolic doctrines and church order of the Epistles and the Acts, but let us add to them a great deal more Apostolic practice, as recommended by Saint James, and enacted by Saint Paul. His writings will show us how to avoid factions, by embracing the whole truth, and holding the proportion of faith. His

practice will show us that Christ himself, and not certain propositions about him, is the end of our Christian service. The means of attaining to Christ, or of serving him, have too often been mistaken for an end in themselves; and, if we look back into history, it is usually about the means, and seldom about the end itself, that human beings have disputed. Christians will only cease to differ when they go back to the breadth, freedom and simplicity of the New Testament, putting wholly on one side the Protestant quarrels of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, and the 'Catholic' errors and ignorance of the Middle Ages. It would be difficult to say whether Sacerdotalists, Papists, or raw Puritans have done most harm to the Church of Christ. As we profess to stand between them, holding the Creeds, possessing the Sacraments, belonging, as I think, to that Church, which comes nearest to the Apostolic and Scriptural pattern, it should be our privilege, instead of adding to the

disputes of Christendom, to lead the way in healing them. This has long been held, by moderate men outside us, to be the function of the English Church. If we fail in it, our responsibility must be very grave: and failure will depend less upon our holding this or that opinion, than upon the temper in which we hold it; or upon the measure in which we practise the Following of Christ, and realize the Letters of Saint Paul.

ROMAN ORDERS: A SUGGESTION

THE Church of England, holding faithfully to tradition, both against certain early heretics and certain modern sects, doth not allow the iteration of those Sacraments which are said to confer a 'Character'; though this term is only of modern, or mediæval, usage. These Sacraments, if we may so describe them all, are Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders. The last, only, is the subject of this consideration.

The rite or Sacrament of Holy Orders may not be repeated; and, acting on this principle, through accepting the validity of Roman 'Orders,' the Church of England does not re-ordain those who come into her Ministry after being ordained by the present Roman formularies, and according

to the present intention, both practical and theoretical, of the modern Papal church, *i.e.* since the decrees of Trent.

The question at issue is, whether modern Roman Orders should be considered valid, in the light of Catholic and primitive tradition.

The question of Orders, according to the Roman view, depends on two things: (1) the Form, (2) the Intention. As the latter is even more damaging than the former to the Roman assumptions, I shall deal with it presently; especially as it is too generally held to be our weakest point, and their strongest.

I. *As to Form.*—So far as I understand the controversy about Orders, the Pope is perfectly right when he asserts, that the Anglican formularies do not satisfy that standard or view of Orders, which is expressed in the modern Roman formularies. Judged by that standard, Anglican Orders are certainly invalid. They fail not only in the wording of their Form, but in what

we must suppose was the intention of those who devised that Form in the XVIth century, and of those others who revised it in the XVIIth.

But, if we take a more Catholic and broader view of the whole question, than Leo XIII. evidently took; that is, a view more scientific and historical; we shall be forced to conclude (α) that the Anglican formulary, in either state, whether of Elizabeth or of Charles II., fully satisfies that view of Holy Orders which is expressed in all the ancient formularies of the East and West, including the Roman; (β) we must conclude, also, that none of the ancient formularies, including the old formularies of the Roman Church, satisfy, any more than the Anglican Form does, that standard of Orders which is maintained by the Papal and Tridentine Church. The conclusion is obvious. The Pope is, if we may say so, held in check by the necessities of his own position. He cannot destroy our Orders after the XVIth

century, without destroying his own Orders before the XIIIth (IVth Lateran Council) century, or at any rate before the XIth (Hildebrand). Moreover, as, through neglecting this broad view, Eugenius IV. went wrong in his Letter to the Armenians, and the Roman theologians had to retreat from their position, so, it may be, Leo XIII., or his Successors, will have to draw back from their present stultifying and suicidal attitude. This, however, is not our affair. Neither the Pope's own position, nor his view about Anglican Orders, is a matter of the smallest anxiety to us, any more than his mistakes are. About them, we made up our mind long ago, and acted on it.

II. But, having noted the different standards or views held about Orders by the Primitive Churches, and by the Tridentine Church, I wish to draw certain conclusions, which seem to me deducible from these premisses.

It may be asked (1) whether a Form of

Orders may not fail by excess, as well as by defect; especially if that excess be so great as to introduce something new, and perhaps contradictory, into the old belief, and into the Form which at one time expressed it?

Such an addition or contradiction seems to be introduced by the present Roman formularies, especially if they be studied by the intention of those who confer and receive these Orders, as well as by the defined theology on which these theories, practices, and so-called Sacraments are based.

α. Can it be said that the anti-Scriptural and anti-Patristic sacrificial powers conferred by Roman Bishops, (as they assert) and accepted by Roman Clerics, are compatible with orthodox and ancient notions of the Eucharistic sacrifice? Are not such notions mutually destructive?

β. Similarly, is not Trans-substantiation destructive of the old orthodox teaching about the Eucharist itself: and is not the

old Orthodox teaching absolutely destructive to Trans-substantiation?

Moreover, we are forced by Article XXVIII. to hold, not only that Trans-substantiation is 'repugnant' to Holy Scripture, but that it 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.'

Can, therefore, those, whose chief intention in giving and receiving modern Roman 'Orders' is to offer private Masses and to Trans-substantiate, be held to have any thing in common with the intention expressed in all the ancient formularies about administering 'God's Holy Sacraments,' and especially the Eucharist, as congregational and public acts?

On the other hand, can the purpose or intention of the ancient formularies, *i.e.* of all the Primitive Churches, be fulfilled in those whose belief about the Eucharist 'overthroweth' the very 'nature' of a Sacrament, and which thus destroys one of the chief ends for which Holy Orders were bequeathed?

Does not the teaching of Article XXVIII. not only condemn Trans-substantiation, but strike implicitly at the whole foundation of Roman 'Orders' themselves?

In other words, does not the intention and belief of those who give and receive Tridentine 'Orders' necessarily exclude, and even destroy, the intention to receive Orders according to the mind of primitive Christianity? However it may be with the 'Intention,' our Article seems to hold that the two beliefs are destructive, and therefore exclusive, of one another.

Our treatises on Orders are, I believe, so entirely defensive and apologetic, that perhaps this line of reasoning has not been sufficiently dwelt on, or even considered.

III. Holy Orders are concerned with two duties: (1) Administration of the Sacraments, (2) Administration of the Word.

For the average Roman Ordinatus, the 'Sacraments' mean (α) the Eucharist, and (β) Penance.

We have considered (α).

As to 'Penance,' in the modern Roman theory and practice of it, can it be said to have any thing in common with what was understood by Penance and Absolution in the Early Church? I observe here the same fundamental difference in theory and practice, between the Tridentine Church and the Primitive Churches, as I have remarked in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

It should be considered how far this may affect the 'Power of the Keys,' the Power of Absolution, as understood formerly, and now. It is nothing less than the difference between publicly excluding from, or re-admitting to, the Christian society; and the pardon, or refusal to pardon, of sins, with regard to the next world, by an individual acting in private, and in his personal capacity.

IV. *Holy Scripture.*—Can the policy of the Roman Church for, say, the last six hundred years, with regard to the teaching and use of Holy Scripture, be held compatible with the intention, expressed by all

the old formularies of Ordination, about the 'Ministry of the Word'? Still more, if the theory of Trans-substantiation strike not only at the Eucharist, but at the very nature of Holy Orders, do not the assertions and pretensions of the Popes, with regard to Holy Scripture (such as that it depends on themselves not only for interpretation, but for authorization and existence) strike even more fatally at all that was intended by the 'Ministry of the Word' in the old ordination services?

Are not the decrees of Trent about the 'Apocrypha' contradictory to the true mind of the Church about what Scripture is? and therefore to the 'Ministry of the Word'?

Do not these contradictions destroy or vitiate Tridentine 'Orders' in another most important aspect of the ministerial Office?

I will not dwell upon the question of Roman 'Orders' as they are affected by Simony, Interdicts, Illegitimacy, Papal and anti-Papal warfare, and all the other dubious and intricate matters of question-

able successions. These were so outside our history, that they do not concern the English Church. In view of Papal declarations, they do, however, concern all Romanists, and those especially of the 'Italian Mission' here in England, whose orders and succession depend solely upon modern and exclusively Roman sources.

For these reasons, and those I have dwelt on more at length, it may be that modern Anglo-Roman 'Orders' are, in more senses than one, an 'imposition of hands.'

It may be objected, that, by parity of reasoning, to doubt the validity of Roman Orders would be to destroy the validity of ours, which depend on them. To this I should answer; No. Those errors about the Eucharist, which led to Trans-substantiation, and so to extravagant notions about the Mass, go back dimly to the 9th century. Up to the time of Hildebrand, 1073–80, opinion about the Sacrament was fluid, as may be seen in his own letters. The first attempt at a definition, as to

the mode of the Real Presence, was made under his auspices. This definition was extended and strengthened by Innocent III., 1198–1216, at the IVth Lateran Council; but it was not until Trent, that the Papal Church was committed finally to its present view. A similar line of history and reasoning applies to Holy Scripture. It was forbidden and repressed, no doubt, by the Dominican Inquisitors, in the thirteenth century; but it was not until Trent that the Inquisition and Index were made over to the Jesuits, that the 'Apocrypha' were canonized, and the repression of Holy Scripture was made a principle, a test of orthodoxy.

The great apostasy dates from Trent; and from Trent, our Lord in his mercy set apart his English Church; leading her to reform herself according to Scripture and Antiquity, instead of 'developing' all the ignorance and corruptions of the Middle Ages.

How far this Apostasy may extend towards invalidating Roman 'Orders'

should, I think, be considered very seriously. The Church of England, in her scrupulosity and charity, has given Rome hitherto the benefit of a doubt. So honest, so moderate, so zealous and single minded has our Church always been, in her desire for truth, that she may rely confidently upon her Divine Head to supply any technical deficiency, should there be any such. In this belief, I rest with entire confidence upon the present discipline of the Church of England in acknowledging the validity of Roman Orders.

I may, however, assert as forcibly as I can, and as a matter of personal experience, that the intention of a Roman Ordinandus in the reception of Orders, and of a Roman Ordinatus in the exercise of them, is opposed diametrically to the intention, as I understand it, of the English Church; and therefore, by implication, to that of the primitive and universal Church.

It is in the Intention, even more than in the Form, that I hold the Tridentine

Church to have gone astray from the ancient models.

The clear Intention of the English Church, as may be seen in the Preface to her Ordination services, is to confer the three Orders named in Holy Scripture, and to continue those offices and officers in her Ministry, according to the primitive and Scriptural meaning of the terms. Gravely as the Latin mediæval Churches may have erred, even here in England, their errors were not made irrevocable until the decrees of Trent. That Council, in spite of the new learning, with all the knowledge it brought of Christian antiquity, in spite of the exposure of many forgeries, deliberately accepted, in the sole interests of the Papacy, many things which the mediæval Churches had only accepted in good faith and ignorance. These mediæval errors, therefore, do not concern us or our Orders vitally. We purged ourselves of them, as soon as we knew them to be wrong. The Papal Church re-affirmed

them, knowing many of them to be based on forgeries. She has made them a vital part of her system and her teaching. Some of them she developed into the Vatican decrees. She stands, or falls, on the weakest point in her whole position, viz. the Papal Infallibility. Her next vulnerable point is the validity of her Orders, both in Form and Intention; if the whole question of Orders be viewed in the light of Scripture and antiquity. So arrogant is the Roman Church in her assertions, so reckless of sobriety and truth, that she has no right to count upon any indulgence for supplying her deficiencies.

The statements of Article XXVIII. seem to me incompatible with a belief in the validity of Roman Orders. Wyclif, in the 9th of his twelve Theses against Transubstantiation goes even farther. He says, 'That an accident can exist without a subject can not be proved; but, if this were so, God himself would be annihilated, and every article of the Christian faith would be destroyed.'

NOTES

Note A [1]

The Acts of Uniformity, it may be, are not precise enough, either in what they allow, or in what they intended to forbid. It should not, however, be beyond our present political capacity to make them definite and clear. We have as full an authority, in this Nineteenth Century, to arrange such matters, as our fathers had in the Seventeenth and Sixteenth Centuries, or as our predecessors had before the Conquest. The rubrics, I believe, were left intentionally vague by Queen Elizabeth, in order that the largest section of her People might be conciliated, without an open violation of the Law, by allowances of 'Catholic' ritual and practice. How far that allowance was made use of, it is not easy to decide. Lord Halifax adopts the two incompatible views, that Elizabethan doctrine, and practice, 'was almost entirely obscured by Calvinism,' and

[1] See p. 129.

that the rubrics were vague because every one understood them in the full 'Catholic' sense. He may hold one view, or the other. He cannot be allowed the use of both. It was equally dangerous, in the time of Elizabeth, to be too precise and narrow in matters of ritual, either in a 'Catholic' or in a Puritan direction. The great Queen herself had strong personal tastes, but she regarded all such matters as un-essential. She thought it equally wrong and foolish to raise them into questions of principle and controversy. Hence, I believe the vagueness of the rubrics. That vagueness enabled us to escape from a great difficulty and danger, without lowering or violating the Law. Since then, time and custom have interpreted the Law, with unequivocal authority. If the strict and narrow letter be on the side of the Ritualists, as I must own it to be in some points, yet I think time and custom are of superior weight. The Privy Council has, no doubt, complicated the matter by contradictory rulings and interpretations; but this is no argument against the jurisdiction of the Privy Council. It is only an argument against the sense, the learning, or the courage, of certain members of it. On the other hand, lists of vestments and church furniture in some few scattered parishes, or accounts of eccentric and uncommon practices, to

which we have not the clue, even when strengthened by a forced interpretation of rubrics left intentionally vague, cannot, and should not, prevail against the ordinary and almost universal practice of the English Church from Elizabeth's day to ours. That, after all, is the most authoritative interpreter of Law. The proceedings now going on at Lambeth seem to me as absurd as if men were to fly in the face of custom and Common Law, and to justify their eccentricity by the Forest Laws, or any other obsolete mediæval Statutes.

Note B [1]

The view of Confession and Absolution given on page 192 was formulated long ago by Wyclif. The Commandments of the Church, to hear Mass on all Sundays and Holidays of Obligation, under pain of mortal sin, and to confess and communicate at least once a year, are not older than Innocent III. It must never be forgotten, that the 'Absolving Power' was a very late addition to the Ordination Services. Private Confession and Priestly Absolution were unknown to the early Church. Primitive discipline bears witness to the exclusion of offenders from the

[1] See p. 192.

Christian Fellowship, and to their re-admission. The Christian Ministry was the mouthpiece, conveying the sentence of the congregation. More than this cannot be inferred from what we know of early beliefs and practices. These practices and beliefs are borne out thoroughly by the words of Saint James about Confession, as well as by the words and action of Saint Paul in the Corinthian Church. It is by the light of these words and practices only, that our Lord's commission or promise must be understood. The practice of Private Confession, the making it obligatory under pain of mortal sin, attributing powers of Absolution to the Ministry, apart from the Congregation, the whole theory of Indulgences, Excommunications, Interdicts and Pardons, are all sacerdotal developments, which have no justification in history or fact.

As with the 'Power of the Keys,' so it is also with the Power of Consecration. The Christian Priesthood is a Ministerial Office, if we may judge by the earliest Liturgies, and the earliest Ordination services. The Minister acts and speaks only in the name of the Congregation, as their mouthpiece and representative. As long ago as the Fourteenth Century, Occam, protesting against Papal absolutism, and the whole theory and practice of the feudalized mediæval hierarchy,

showed the danger to the Church of having one Sovereign Pontiff. He then went on to argue, that Councils, representing the whole Church, must be able to judge or depose the Pontiff. 'Every man,' he said, 'is competent to be his judge, but his ordinary judge is the Emperor.' This assertion of the old Imperial Supremacy, so thoroughly historical and orthodox, bears witness to the soundness and sagacity of Occam. He goes on to argue, further, that a true Council must necessarily be a representative body. 'Every society and corporation,' he asserts, 'can make laws for itself, and choose persons to act for the whole body. As all believers form one Society, they may choose their representatives. When thus elected, they form a General Council.' He contrasts a Council, thus chosen and assembled, with the Papal Councils of his own and the preceding age. We may contrast it still more sharply with the Council of Trent, packed with Italian bishops; or with the Vatican Council, swamped by Bishops in Partibus, representing nobody, merely registering the opinions and policy of the Curia. The whole theory of General Councils, as a means for ascertaining universal and primitive belief, rested on the assumption that the bishops represented their Churches, and bore witness to local opinions or traditions. That

theory of Orders, which I indicated above, seems to me a logical and a necessary deduction from Occam's theory of Councils. It is also, as I think, entirely in agreement with Primitive beliefs and practices, and with the Apostolical Christianity of the New Testament. It seems to be the only means of reconciling the present differences between Christians about Orders and Sacraments. Occam turns away, finally, from the Church of his own age, which was destined to become more arbitrary, and less constitutional. He makes a touching appeal to 'men of future times, who are zealous for truth, righteousness, and the common good. They may have their attention directed to many truths about these things, which at present remain hidden, to the great loss of the community.' Such truths, as I think, have been illustrated by many developments and discoveries in science and philosophy. It still remains for us to apply our higher knowledge of politics and society to the polity and the Ministry of the Church. Such an application does not mean the destruction of old truths, but only the truer understanding of them, and their disengagement from the barbarous interpretations of the Papal and mediæval innovators.

Spottiswoode & Co. Printers, New-street Square, London

WORKS ON THEOLOGY, &c.

BROOKE, Rev. STOPFORD A., Christ in Modern Life. Seventeenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

The Spirit of the Christian Life. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

The Fight of Faith. Sermons preached on various occasions. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Sermons. Two Series. Thirteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* each.

Theology in the English Poets—Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Burns. Sixth Edition. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

CHEYNE, Canon T. K., The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter. The Bampton Lectures, 1889. 8vo. 16*s.*

The Prophecies of Isaiah. With Notes and Dissertations. Fifth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 25*s.*

Job and Solomon; or, The Wisdom of the Old Testament. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Book of Psalms; or, the Praises of Israel. With Commentary. 8vo. 16*s.* Elzevir 8vo. (*Parchment Library*). Vellum. 7*s.* 6*d.*; parchment or cloth, 6*s.*

CLODD, EDWARD, Jesus of Nazareth. With a Brief Sketch of Jewish History to the Time of His Birth. Second Edition. Small crown 8vo. 6*s.* Special Edition for Schools, in 2 parts, 1*s.* 6*d.* each.

Childhood of Religions, including a Simple Account of the Birth and Growth of Myths and Legends. New Edition, revised and partly re-written. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* Special Edition for schools, 1*s.* 6*d.*

COX, Rev. SAMUEL, D.D., Commentary on the Book of Job. With a Translation. Second Edition. 8vo. 15*s.*

Balaam. An Exposition and a Study. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Miracles. An Argument and a Challenge. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Salvator Mundi; or, Is Christ the Saviour of all Men? Twelfth Edition. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Larger Hope. A Sequel to 'Salvator Mundi.' Second Edition. 16mo. 1*s.*

Genesis of Evil, and other Sermons, mainly Expository. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

DAVIDSON, SAMUEL, Introduction to the New Testament. Third Edition, Revised and enlarged. 2 vols. demy 8vo. 30*s.*

DAWSON, GEORGE, The Authentic Gospel, and other Sermons. Edited by GEORGE ST. CLAIR. Fourth Edition. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Every-day Counsels. Edited by GEORGE ST. CLAIR. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Prayers. First Series. Edited by his Wife. Tenth Edition. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.* Second Series. Edited by GEORGE ST. CLAIR. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Sermons on Disputed Points and Special Occasions. Edited by his Wife. Fifth Edition. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Sermons on Daily Life and Duty. Edited by his Wife. Fifth Edition. Small 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

EYTON, ROBERT, The Apostles' Creed. Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The True Life, and other Sermons. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

The Lord's Prayer. Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Ten Commandments. Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Search for God, and other Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Temptation of Jesus, and other Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Beatitudes. Sermons. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HAWEIS, Rev. H. R., Current Coin. Materialism—The Devil—Crime — Drunkenness — Pauperism — Emotion — Recreation — The Sabbath. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

Arrows in the Air. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

Speech in Season. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

Thoughts for the Times. Fourteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

Unsectarian Family Prayers. New Edition. Foolscap 8vo. 1*s*. 6*d*.

MOORE, AUBREY L., Science and the Faith: Essays on Apologetic Subjects. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

PEARSON, SAMUEL, Scholars of Christ. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

Week-day Living. Third Edition, Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

PULPIT COMMENTARY, The. Edited by the Very Rev. Dean H. D. M. SPENCE, D.D., and Rev. J. S. EXELL. Complete in 49 Volumes. Medium 8vo. £14. 14*s*. the Set, or 6*s*. per volume.

A HANDSOME REVOLVING BOOKCASE, in dark oak, has been specially designed to contain the above; price £2. 10*s*. net.

RICHARDSON, AUSTIN, What are the Catholic Claims? Introduction by Rev. LUKE RIVINGTON. Crown 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

RIVINGTON, Rev. LUKE, Authority; or, A Plain Reason for Joining the Church of Rome. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Dependence; or, The Insecurity of the Anglican Position. Crown 8vo. 5*s*.

ROBERTSON, Rev. F. W., Notes on Genesis. New and Cheaper Edition. Small 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. Expository Lectures. New Edition. Small 8vo. 5*s*.

Lectures and Addresses, with other Literary Remains. New Edition. Small 8vo. 5*s*.

Sermons. Five Series. Small 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*. each; People's Edition, 1*s*. 6*d*. net per volume. With new Portrait, Preface by C. B ROBERTSON, and Introduction. by IAN MACLAREN.

*** Portrait of the late Rev. F. W. ROBERTSON, mounted for framing, 2*s*. 6*d*.

TRENCH, Archbishop, Notes on the Parables of our Lord. 8vo. 12*s*. Cheap Edition. Sixty-first Thousand. 7*s* 6*d*.

Notes on the Miracles of our Lord 8vo. 12*s*. Cheap Edition. Forty-eighth Thousand. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Brief Thoughts and Meditations on some Passages in Holy Scripture. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Apocalypse: Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia. Fourth Edition, revised. 8vo. 8*s*. 6*d*.

On the Authorised Version of the New Testament. Second Edition. 8vo. 7*s*.

Proverbs and their Lessons. Eighth Edition, enlarged. Foolscap 8vo. 4*s*.

Studies in the Gospels. Fifth Edition, revised. 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

Synonyms of the New Testament. Tenth Edition, enlarged. 8vo. 12*s*.

Sermons, New and Old. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

Lectures on Mediæval Church History. Being the substance of Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London. Second Edition. 8vo. 12*s*.

Shipwrecks of Faith. Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Foolscap 8vo. 2*s*. 6*d*.

Westminster and other Sermons. Crown 8vo. 6*s*.

London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO., LTD.
Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the date to which renewed. Renewals only:
Tel. No. 642-3405
Renewals may be made 4 days prior to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

MAY 10 1971 8 0

REC'D LD MAY 17 71 -3 PM 8 5

JAN 22 1982
UCLA
INTERLIBRARY LOAN

LD21A–50m-2,'71
(P2001s10)476—A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C032356940